

J. PATRICK KELLY  
El Paso County Clerk and Recorder  
200 South Cascade Avenue  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

NONPROFIT ORG  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO  
PERMIT NO. 3



## El Paso County

NOTICE OF ELECTION  
TO INCREASE TAXES / TO INCREASE DEBT /  
ON A CITIZEN PETITION / ON A REFERRED MEASURE

THIS PAMPHLET CONTAINS INFORMATION ON BALLOT ISSUES AS REQUIRED BY THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 FOR LOCAL ISSUES.

A "YES" vote on any measure is a vote IN FAVOR OF changing constitutional or statutory law, and a "NO" vote on any measure is a vote AGAINST changing constitutional or statutory law.

November 6, 2001  
Mail Ballot Election

# NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES / TO INCREASE DEBT / ON A CITIZEN PETITION / ON A REFERRED MEASURE

**ELECTION DATE:** November 6, 2001

**ELECTION BY MAIL BALLOT:** Mail ballots for the Coordinated Election must be received in the Clerk & Recorder's Office by 7:00pm on November 6, 2001.

**ELECTION OFFICE:** El Paso County Clerk & Recorder, 200 South Cascade Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80903.

**TELEPHONE:** (719) 575-VOTE (575-8683). For hearing impaired: TDD (719) 520-6286.

**INTERNET ADDRESS:** <http://www.elpasoco.com/clerkrcd/elemain.asp>

**EMAIL ADDRESS:** [carweb@elpasoco.com](mailto:carweb@elpasoco.com)

This Notice of Election was prepared in accordance with Section 20 of Article X of the Colorado Constitution and the Colorado Uniform Election Code of 1992, as amended. The information contained in this Notice was prepared by persons required by law to provide summaries of ballot issues and fiscal information. The El Paso County Clerk & Recorder's Office does not warrant, verify or confirm the accuracy or truth of the ballot titles, questions, text, and summaries of comments as presented below, nor is it responsible for errors in spelling, grammar, or punctuation of the materials presented below. For further information or clarification concerning any of the following ballot questions, please contact the respective Designated Election Official as indicated below. Ballot issues for the State will be provided separately by the State. Further, this Notice contains issues for the following jurisdictions conducting elections separate from the Coordinated Election: Greater Downtown Business Improvement District, Falcon Regional Transportation Metropolitan District, and Woodmen Road Metropolitan District. Voters may receive additional materials from other jurisdictions conducting independent elections.

## EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION A1

Designated Election Official:

J. Patrick Kelly, JD CERA  
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder  
200 South Cascade Avenue  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903  
(719) 520-6200

### NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: A1

SHALL THE COUNTY OF EL PASO, COLORADO BE PERMITTED TO EXPEND REVENUES ABOVE THE 2000 FISCAL YEAR SPENDING LIMITATION MANDATED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, THE AMOUNT BEING UP TO \$8,800,000, WITH THE EXCESS REVENUE BEING SHARED WITH THE CITIES AND TOWNS WITH THE COUNTY IN THE SAME MANNER AS EL PASO COUNTY SHARES ROAD AND BRIDGE PROPERTY TAX REVENUE, AND WITH THE EL PASO COUNTY RETAINED PORTION BEING USED FOR THE PURPOSES OF ROAD, BRIDGE AND DRAINAGE PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE EL PASO COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

El Paso County receives some money from the state of Colorado. The Taxpayer Bill of Rights, or TABOR, approved by voters in 1992 limits the amount of revenue the county is allowed to spend without voter approval. Ballot question A1 asks voters to exempt that money from being counted toward the county's TABOR limit. This is not a tax increase, and the county is not asking the voters for a tax increase.

In 1997, the state created a problem for the county by changing the way it handled those monies. Prior to 1997, the state would pay the costs for departments, such as the County Department of Transportation's Road and Bridge Fund, then require the county to reimburse the state for its share, usually 20 to 25 percent of the total. In 1997, however, the state began giving its share instead to the county, which meant the county had to count it as revenue. Additionally, since the state share continues to far exceed the county's, that large amount of money also counts against the limitation on spendable county funds. Had state money not counted against county spending limits, the county would have been below its spending limits every year since TABOR passed.

What this means for El Paso County's citizens is they are not seeing any maximized benefits from growth. Money that could be used for road, bridge and drainage projects must instead be turned back. That means El Paso County residents live every day with the negative consequences of growth because, while an increasing population requires more services from its county government, the citizens cannot reap the benefits of this revenue because the limitation decreases the county's ability to provide these services.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* Taking away \$8,800,000 in our county tax refunds is an \$8,800,000 tax increase. Vote "NO" on issue A1.

## EL PASO COUNTY QUESTION A1 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* In this time of war, recession, and falling stock markets, government must leave money in the private sector to revive the economy. Congress and the President understand that; why not local politicians?
- \* Half would go to cities, which will refund it to their taxpayers as excess revenue. Why transfer your county tax refund to strangers? If really needed, the county would ask for it all.
- \* Commissioners refused to disclose on the ballot that tax refunds were at risk; don't reward political deceit by funding their secret pet projects.
- \* The county recently "found" \$12 million "extra" among its many accounts
- \* This issue is too vague. It does not describe specific projects. If their need for our money is so urgent, why couldn't they say what we would get for our money? They think they deserve it more than we the people who earned it, that we should just shut up and pay.
- \* We are overtaxed. That's why we have a refund. The county should cut taxes, not take our tax refunds.
- \* Roadwork should come from the normal budget. The basics should come first, not be optional "extras" to force us to give up our legal right to tax refunds. That's blackmail.
- \* Other governments are refunding excess revenue; why can't the county? We get tax refunds only by voting "NO." The county will pay us to vote "NO."
- \* County revenue automatically increases millions of dollars yearly for growth plus inflation. Their spending has risen faster than our income. Don't bring back the bad old days of unlimited spending, more bureaucracy, more regulations, more waste, less freedom.
- \* The county hands money to insider groups. They mismanage surplus property, and overpay for property. The county paid double the assessed value for a downtown parking lot. They just gave one bureaucrat a 32% pay raise. They illegally borrow millions without voter approval for more office space for more staff. Voting "NO" will force review of budget priorities and encourage consolidation of city and county services in areas like law enforcement, health, parks, etc.
- \* We must make hard choices politicians won't. Government can't do everything for everyone.
- \* Tax refunds help the economy—money in the private sector means more jobs. Taxes are almost 50% of income now; saving one tax dollar equals a \$2 pay raise. You can return your tax refund, but don't take it away from low-income and senior citizens who need it.
- \* The county hasn't considered any alternatives to taking more of our money.
- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better—you or some bureaucrat?
- \* Send them a message: Enough is enough!
- \* Reject unlimited spending without accountability to taxpayers. Make the county live on a budget, not a blank check. Get your tax refund. Vote "NO" on A1.

EL PASO COUNTY  
QUESTION A2

Designated Election Official:

J. Patrick Kelly, JD CERA  
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder  
200 South Cascade Avenue  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903  
(719) 520-6200

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: A2

WITHOUT CREATING ANY NEW TAX OR INCREASING ANY CURRENT TAXES AND WITHOUT FURTHER VOTER APPROVAL, SHALL THE COUNTY OF EL PASO BE PERMITTED, IN 2002 AND IN EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR THEREAFTER, TO RETAIN AND SPEND ON LAWFUL COUNTY PURPOSES COUNTY REVENUES RECEIVED BY THE COUNTY FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY STATE SPENDING OR REVENUE LIMITATION?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

El Paso County receives some money from the state of Colorado. The Taxpayer Bill of Rights, or TABOR approved by voters in 1992, requires that money coming from the state must be counted as revenue for the county. Thus, that money is counted as revenue twice: once by the state, then again by the county. Ballot question A2 asks voters to exempt that money from being counted toward the county's TABOR limit. That's the limit set on the amount of revenue the county is allowed to spend without voter approval.

The biggest county recipients of state funds are El Paso County Department of Human Services and the County Department of Transportation's Road and Bridge Fund. In 1997, the state created a problem for the county by changing the way it handled those monies. Prior to 1997, the state would pay the costs for these departments, then require the county to reimburse the state for its share, usually 20 to 25 percent of the total. In 1997, however, the state began giving its share instead to the county, which meant the county had to count it as revenue. Additionally, since the state share continues to far exceed the county's, that large amount of money also counts against the limitation on spendable county funds. Had state money not counted against county spending limits, the county would have been below its spending limits every year since TABOR passed.

What this means for El Paso County's citizens is they are not seeing any maximized benefits from growth. Money that could be used for local infrastructure, customer service improvements, etc., must instead be turned back. That means El Paso County residents live every day with the negative consequences of growth because, while an increasing population requires more services from its county government, the citizens cannot reap the benefits of this revenue because the limitation decreases the county's ability to provide these services.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* This reduces county tax refunds, like this year's \$8.8 million, FOREVER! That's a tax increase, despite county claims. We have no right to petition the county, so we can NEVER change this. We can't alter a state constitutional definition of "revenue" in a local vote; a child knows that! Co. Spgs. voters already rejected this scam by a landslide. A2 would lead to lawsuits the county would lose. Taxpayers would have to pay costs and attorney fees on both sides. County finances would be in turmoil for years until the case was over. That's really dumb. Vote NO on A2.
- \* Why no listing how this windfall of millions will be spent? Are the politicians so arrogant they think it's none of our business how they spend millions of our dollars? That money is ours unless they trick us into voting away our right to monitor their spending and to vote on excess revenue.
- \* They want to continue the old switcheroo. When we complain about county programs, they say they're state-funded so we can't change them. Other times, it is county-funded, but run under state rules and we can't change that either. Government is not accountable either way. Generally, each government should spend the money it raises. The county should stop pursuing the illusion of "free" state money. It is still all taxpayer money, and we want the excess revenue back in OUR pockets, not government's. If the state has money to give away, it is excess and should return to taxpayers anyway.
- \* If the county thinks state funds are too much trouble, they can stop applying for grants! They could then release grant application writers for more useful work, like filling potholes or mowing lawns, not shuffling our tax money around so we can't find it.

EL PASO COUNTY  
QUESTION A2 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* The county can try to change state practices of sending state funds to the county. Money may be pooled into a bank trust fund, so the county never receives it. Politicians never think of alternatives; they just want more. A2 is just a pretext to get "voter approval" to violate the state constitution. They hope we no longer know basic civics!
- \* Because of the recession and passage of increased school funding, the state surplus has evaporated. So the state will cut back and this scheme wouldn't be needed anyway for many years, if ever.
- \* The county doesn't know its total revenue until months after the fiscal year ends. They have more millions than they can count! Should we lose tax refunds because they are rich or incompetent?
- \* It is poor public policy to rely on outside governmental handouts for local programs. When those funds dry up, the county must pay for those programs by raising taxes, cutting other programs, or firing workers. Such instability is caused by commissioners who line up at the fluctuating trough of government spending. It should be discouraged. Get the county commissioners off welfare. Vote NO on A2.

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B1

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B1

SHALL CITY DEBT BE INCREASED \$63,470,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$104,590,808 (MAXIMUM), BONDED FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS, PAYABLE FROM PLEDGES OF SALES/USE TAXES AND CONSTITUTING VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to issue its sales and use tax revenue bonds payable from all or a portion of the City's existing 2% sales/use tax that is dedicated to the City General Fund as the Council may determine, to finance the transportation and traffic mitigation capital improvement projects and equipment listed below as recommended by the Citizens' Coordination Committee of the Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP 01) and as approved by Council, in one or more series, to be subject to redemption (with or without premium), to be dated and sold at such time or times and in such manner and at such prices (at, above or below par), and to contain such terms, not inconsistent herewith, as the City Council may determine. THIS QUESTION DOES NOT PROPOSE NOR DOES IT AUTHORIZE ANY INCREASE IN CITY TAXES TO REPAY THESE BONDS.

Transportation and Traffic Mitigation Capital Improvement Projects

Union Blvd Interchange at Austin Bluffs Parkway ; Citywide Neighborhood & School Traffic Calming, Phase II ; Citywide Traffic Loop Replacement ; Fillmore Street Corridor Improvements, I-25 to Union Boulevard, Phase II ; Cresta Road Sidewalks ; Citywide Congestion & Incident Management Signal Improvements ; Citywide Roadway Safety and Traffic Operations ; Academy Blvd. Reconstruction - Maizeland to Galley, Phase II ; Circle Drive / Bijou Street Intersection Improvement ; Citywide Pedestrian Safety Improvements ; Academy Blvd. / Dublin Boulevard Intersection Improvement ; 30th Street Corridor Safety Improvements, Garden of the Gods Road to Mesa Road ; Austin Bluffs Corridor Improvement - Barnes Road to Stetson Hills ; Rusina Road Improvements, Phase II ; ADA Pedestrian Ramp Program ; Ivywild Public Improvements ; Street Resurfacing ; Union Blvd Improvements, Fillmore Street to Fountain Blvd ; Snow Blowers - 2 ; Traffic Signal Upgrades

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B1 (cont)**

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Year	Fiscal Year Spending (FYS)	Federal Funds
1997 actual	\$ 181,415,536	\$ 14,659,647
1998 actual	\$ 185,768,709	\$ 21,032,324
1999 actual	\$ 190,697,485	\$ 24,521,869
2000 actual	\$ 182,134,775	\$ 23,118,181
2001 estimate	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 22,000,000
Overall dollar change to FYS (1997-2001)		\$ 18,584,464
Overall percentage change to FYS (1997-2001)		10.24%
Overall dollar change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		\$ 25,924,817
Overall percentage change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		13.22%
Principal amount of new debt to be issued		\$ 63,470,000
Maximum annual repayment cost of new debt		\$ 5,232,110
Maximum total repayment cost of new debt		\$ 104,590,808
Principal balance of current bonded debt		\$ 105,934,000
Maximum annual repayment cost of current debt		\$ 11,208,000
Total repayment cost of current debt		\$ 143,370,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B1 will not require new taxes. The strength and good fiscal reputation of our city government allows us to make these improvements through bonds.
- \* Question B1 is just one of seven choices that my city has provided. I appreciate having a choice, and I am voting yes because I support my community.
- \* Question B1 will fund road and transportation projects and programs that are needed to ensure that our community is safe and secure for our citizens. Good transportation systems are vital to our community's security.
- \* Question B1 will fund road and transportation projects that will ease traffic congestion, reducing the time we waste in traffic jams. And we have no new taxes.
- \* Question B1 will provide funding to improve synchronization of traffic signals, reducing time wasted at intersections.
- \* Question B1 will improve the traffic flow at major intersections throughout the city, reducing commute times and improving safety.
- \* Question B1 will boost the city's efforts to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, providing ramps at intersections.
- \* Question B1's improved transportation systems will help to reduce road rage, red-light runners and other unlawful or inappropriate uses of vehicles.
- \* Question B1 proposes a highly specific package of needed transportation projects. When you vote for the proposal, you will not be giving a blank check to the government.
- \* Many cities use bonds to finance major improvements. This method is fiscally conservative, safe and requires no tax increases, yet is capable of producing major benefits to the community.
- \* In order to bond for these projects, the City Council cut expenses out of the general fund budget and found new revenue sources such as new fees that developers must pay. Other new fees include more severe fines for people breaking traffic laws.
- \* The interest that the city will pay on those bonds could cost the city less than if the city waits to do these projects at some future point because of higher future construction costs.
- \* The interest payments that the city makes on these bonds are exempt from the cap contained in the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights. Therefore, TABOR actually encourages cities to use bonds as financing methods.
- \* Selling bonds and paying them off over time is a great way for growth to pay for itself. New residents, as well as county residents and tourists, share the burden of providing roads and other infrastructure with city residents.
- \* Question B1 is the product of grass-roots process. The Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP), a coalition of hundreds of residents has worked thousands of hours in recent years to identify the most pressing needs for Colorado Springs. Only the most critical projects were included.
- \* Politicians or city bureaucrats did not craft the package. It is the work of your neighbors and friends. It is a reflection of the community's priorities. Every neighborhood – every resident – will benefit in very real, very tangible ways from the improvements.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* \$63,400,000.00 in new city debt. \$41,000,000.00 in interest fixes no roads. This is deficit spending. We spend it, our children must pay it back. That is an immoral time bomb. Vote no on the B1 bomber.
- \* We are in recession, at war. Stock markets are sliding. The state is cutting construction spending. This is the worst time to take on massive debt. It will be harder to repay if the economy shrinks dramatically. Terrorism or other events change reality overnight; debt is bad partly because it wrongly relies on everything staying the same, and everything will not.
- \* The vice-mayor is already promoting more borrowing for 2003. Council members are spendaholics and we need to send them a message: live on a budget! Live within our means! Do not stick it to our kids.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B1 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* There is no interest rate cap. Also, nothing prevents existing road money from being diverted to pay raises after replacement by this new debt. Council is planning the shift-and-shaft game again.
- \* The city has already announced \$10,000,000.00 in pay raises for next year. They always pay themselves first and put public safety and convenience last. Are you tired of their cynical games?
- \* B1 projects are vague. Many projects approved in past elections are still not done.
- \* The city manager admitted in city ads-our traffic problems were caused by ¼ century of poor (city) planning. 25% of the B1 bond is to fix one intersection misdesigned from the start.
- \* City study of Platte/Nevada costs \$150,000; four \$25.00 No Left Turn signs below the statue fix the problem. City loses \$6,000,000.00/year on empty buses; let us use the savings on roads. Let us time traffic lights at no cost.
- \* The citizens' SCIP Finance Committee report recommended against tax and debt increases. Council promised to obey it, then ignored it. The 8 page report details dozens of ways for the city to save over \$35,000,000.00 yearly.
- \* City spending figures printed here are false. City spending last year did not fall; it rose. Why are they lying? The city also expects a \$22,000,000.00 increase next year without a tax increase. That could pay for all projects in three years, saving \$41,000,000.00 interest. Spending increases since 1997 were over twice the amounts reported. Bonded debt is millions higher. They have tens of millions in hidden liabilities besides bonded debt.
- \* Debt removes budgetary flexibility, will force tax hikes for future needs as they arise. The father of America's Declaration of Independence said of deficit spending "I place economy among the first and most virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared....To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with public debt....We must make our choice between economy and liberty or confusion and servitude....If we run into such debts, we must be taxed."
- \* Do not do this to your children. No on B1.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B2**

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B2

SHALL CITY DEBT BE INCREASED \$37,825,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$62,326,660 (MAXIMUM), BONDED FOR STORMWATER PROJECTS, PAYABLE FROM PLEDGES OF SALES/USE TAXES AND CONSTITUTING VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to issue its sales and use tax revenue bonds payable from all or a portion of the City's existing 2% sales/use tax that is dedicated to the General Fund as the Council may determine, to finance the stormwater and flood control capital improvement projects listed below as recommended by the Citizens' Coordination Committee of the Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP 01) and as approved by Council, in one or more series, to be subject to redemption (with or without premium), to be dated and sold at such time or times and in such manner and at such prices (at, above or below par), and to contain such terms, not inconsistent herewith, as the City Council may determine. THIS QUESTION DOES NOT PROPOSE NOR DOES IT AUTHORIZE ANY INCREASE IN CITY TAXES TO REPAY THESE BONDS.

**Stormwater and Flood Control Capital Improvement Projects**

Fountain Creek Improvements - Upstream of 21st St. & Monument Creek Downstream to Hwy 24 Bypass ; Academy Blvd. / Halfturn Drainage Improvement ; Cottonwood Creek Drainage Channel ; T-Gap Floodway- Nevada to Union Study ; East Fork of Sand Creek ; Arcturus / Cheyenne Run Drainage ; Barnes Inlets / Doherty Channel ; Rustic Hills Channel Improvements ; Dry Creek at Discovery (Rockrimmon) ; Meadows Channel between Southgate Road and Mt. Warner Circle ; T-Gap Floodway at Union Boulevard ; Sand Creek Channel Improvements (Main Stem), Phase II ; Monterey Drive Channel & Storm Sewer System,

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B2 (cont)**

Question: B2 (cont)

Phase I ; Drainage Basin Planning Studies ; El Morro Concrete Ditch at Academy Boulevard ; 19th Street Detention Pond Outfall ; King Street Detention Pond Chestnut Street Storm Sewer Outfall ; Golden Hills / Popes Valley Storm Sewer ; Mesa Springs Drainage ; Ranch Lane Drainage ; Pitkin Street Drainage ; El Sereno Drainage ; 1513 Manitou Boulevard Drainage ; Baltic Street / Fountain Street Drainage ; Sierra Madre Street Storm Sewer ; 31st Street Drainage & Roadway Improvements

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Year	Fiscal Year Spending (FYS)	Federal Funds
1997 actual	\$ 181,415,536	\$ 14,659,647
1998 actual	\$ 185,768,709	\$ 21,032,324
1999 actual	\$ 190,697,485	\$ 24,521,869
2000 actual	\$ 182,134,775	\$ 23,118,181
2001 estimate	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 22,000,000
Overall dollar change to FYS (1997-2001)		\$ 18,584,464
Overall percentage change to FYS (1997-2001)		10.24%
Overall dollar change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		\$ 25,924,817
Overall percentage change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		13.22%
Principal amount of new debt to be issued		\$ 37,825,000
Maximum annual repayment cost of new debt		\$ 3,118,815
Maximum total repayment cost of new debt		\$ 62,326,661
Principal balance of current bonded debt		\$ 105,934,000
Maximum annual repayment cost of current debt		\$ 11,208,000
Total repayment cost of current debt		\$ 143,370,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B2 will not require new taxes. The good reputation and fiscal management of our city government allows us to make these improvements through bonds.
- \* Question B2 is just one of seven choices that my city has provided. I appreciate having a choice, and I am voting yes because I support my community.
- \* Question B2 will fund stormwater and flood control projects that are needed to ensure that our community is safe and secure for our citizens and our country. National security begins at home.
- \* Question B2 will fund projects that will help keep our local economy to stay strong.
- \* Question B2 will fund drainage projects that will keep our families, homes and businesses safer from floodwaters. Lives are on the line all the time when we have severe storms and flooding.
- \* Question B2 will fund drainage projects all over the community to improve the safety of all. Especially needed are drainage repairs and improvements in older neighborhoods.
- \* Question B2 proposes a highly specific package of needed drainage projects. When you vote for the proposal, you will not be giving a blank check to the government. In fact, a citizens advisory board will ensure the money is spent only as promised.
- \* Many cities use bonds to finance major improvements. This method is fiscally conservative, safe and requires no tax increases, yet is capable of producing major benefits to the community.
- \* In order to bond for these projects, the City Council cut expenses out of the general fund budget and found new revenue sources such as new fees that developers must pay. Other new fees include more severe fines for people breaking traffic laws.
- \* The additional fees that developers must pay are an important beginning step in making growth pay for itself.
- \* The interest that the city will pay on those bonds could cost the city less than if the city waits to do these projects at some point because of higher future construction costs.
- \* The interest payments that the city makes on these bonds are exempt from the cap contained in the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights. Therefore, TABOR actually encourages cities to use bonds as financing methods.
- \* Selling bonds and paying them off over time is a great way for growth to pay for itself. New residents, as well as county residents and tourists, share the burden of providing roads and other infrastructure with city residents.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* Another \$37,800,000.00 in deficit spending. This time it is for drainage, which should also be in the basic budget, not an optional extra. \$24,500,000.00 in interest buys nothing; it is money down the drain. Vote no on B2.
- \* We are in both recession and war. Stock markets are tumbling. The state cuts construction spending. Our city must also tighten its belt. Massive debt will be harder to repay as the economy shrinks. Terrorism and other events changed our world. Debt is bad partly because it assumes no problems and a growing economy. That is not reality.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B2 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* We spend the money, then send the bill to our children. That is immoral.
- \* B2 has no interest rate cap. Also, nothing prevents existing drainage spending from being diverted to pay raises after replacement by this new debt. Council is playing the shift-and-shaft game again.
- \* The city has already announced \$10,000,000.00 in pay raises for next year. They always pay themselves first and put public safety last. The only way to disapprove their cynical games is to vote no.
- \* By refusing to do stormwater projects without this debt, Council holds us hostage. The city threatens our safety from flooding while raising their pay. That is blackmail. Send them the message that it is also bad politics.
- \* Many B2 projects are easily done. They involve a few days of bulldozing dirt and brush from drainage channels clogged by years of intentional neglect. Council knows we will not approve more money for city bonuses and frills, so they spend on them first and say the basics cost more. That is backwards; the basics come first.
- \* Most SCIP projects approved in past elections are still not done.
- \* The citizens' SCIP Finance Committee report recommended against tax and debt increases. Council promised to obey it, then ignored it. The 8 page report details dozens of ways for the city to save over \$35,000,000.00 yearly.
- \* City spending figures printed here are false. City spending last year did not fall; it rose. Why are they lying? The city also expects a \$22,000,000.00 increase next year without a tax increase. That could pay for all projects in two years, saving \$25,000,000.00 interest. Spending increases since 1997 were over twice the amounts reported. Bonded debt is tens of millions higher. They have tens of millions in liabilities besides bonded debt.
- \* Debt removes budgetary flexibility, will force tax hikes for future needs as they arise. The father of America's Declaration of Independence said of deficit spending, "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared....To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with public debt....We must make our choice between economy and liberty or confusion and servitude....If we run into such debts, we must be taxed."
- \* Vote no on B2. It is not a vitamin, it is a poison pill.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B3**

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B3

SHALL THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS BE PERMITTED TO SPEND UP TO \$1,557,631.00 FOR THE PROJECT LISTED BELOW, THIS AMOUNT BEING THE ESTIMATED 2000 REVENUES ABOVE THE 2000 FISCAL YEAR SPENDING LIMITATION AMOUNT AS MANDATED BY THE TAXPAYER'S BILL OF RIGHTS?

Project: Platte Avenue/ Chelton Road Intersection Improvements

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B3 is just one of the seven choices that the city has provided me. I appreciate having a choice, and I am voting yes.
- \* Question B3 requires no new taxes. Our city government is abiding by the law in asking to retain \$1,600,000.00 to work on a specific project; easing traffic through the intersection of Platte Avenue and Chelton Road.
- \* A refund on this question would not be cost-efficient for the city. This money is better spend reducing our traffic congestion and improving safety of this important intersection.
- \* To make this improvement possible, the City Council cut expenses out of the general fund budget and found new revenue sources such as new fees that developers must pay. Other new fees include more severe fines for people breaking traffic laws.
- \* This question is a no-brainer. This is what Taxpayer's Bill of Rights was meant to do, make government accountable to the people. I will be happy to see this intersection improved.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B3 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* B3 takes away \$1,560,000.00 of our tax refunds. Despite requests to disclose this in the ballot title, Council refused. They want you to think they are just asking permission to fix an intersection. Baloney. They want to raise your taxes by spending your tax refund. Vote no on B3.
- \* Vague improvements to one intersection would be made. To avoid refunding anything to taxpayers, the city will spend the whole amount, even if not needed. The intersection will be repaired without this money anyway.
- \* It is unseemly that, with hundreds of millions in yearly spending, the city is fighting us over a tiny fraction of their budget. Sadly, they are obsessed with taking absolutely everything from us we will tolerate. It is time to tell them to stop bleeding us and start budgeting themselves.
- \* Road work should be part of the regular city budget. What are we paying all these taxes for? The city needs to live within constitutional and charter spending limits, and not hold repairs or safety hostages to try to coerce us into giving up tax refunds. Send them a message: we reject your threats.
- \* The Council wants B3 to be a referendum on roads. It is not. We expect basic services from existing taxes. Voting no will give the city a mild incentive to economize. They lose \$6,000,000.00 yearly running empty buses. They plan \$10,000,000.00 in pay raises next year. They gave away Penrose Equestrian Center, valued at \$4,500,000.00, for a buck. That is right-one dollar. They paid to bulldoze a downtown building they owned, valued at half a million, to make a parking lot for council members, so their lordships would not have to park on the street as we peons do. They gave away Old City Hall to a dummy corporation they created, and are now buying it back for over \$12,000,000.00, with interest. This swindle was a way to avoid asking for voter approval of the money they borrowed to redecorate their new council offices. Had enough?
- \* The city spends every revenue dollar it is entitled to collect under the law. But last year, they had a \$10,000,000.00 windfall in unexpected sales tax revenue. If they were at their revenue limit, and then got an extra \$10,000,000.00, why are they saying last year's surplus is only \$1,600,000.00? Because they are cheating us, that is why. We need an outside audit of city finances; they are cooking the books.
- \* The citizens' SCIP Finance Committee report recommended against tax and debt increases. Council promised to obey it, then ignored it. The 8 page report details dozens of ways for the city to save over \$35,000,000.00 yearly. Ask Council for a copy. They can stop their multi-million dollar subsidy of tourist advertising. They can close down their business loan slush fund. They can reduce their millions of dollars on public relations.
- \* Stop their scam. Get your money back. Vote no on B3.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B4**

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B4

SHALL CITY TAXES BE INCREASED \$26,975,000 ANNUALLY BY LEVYING A 4/10% SALES/USE TAX FOR POLICE AND FIRE CAPITAL/OPERATING NEEDS AND CONSTITUTING A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to increase its sales and use tax rate by 4/10% (four pennies on a \$10 purchase) to fund public safety personnel, equipment and operations, including necessary internal support, and to finance the construction of Fire stations and Police substations, and other public safety facilities as recommended by the Citizens' Coordination Committee of the Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP 01) and as approved by City Council, and without limiting the collection or spending of any other revenues or funds by the City under TABOR, Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter, and without the increase being subject to TABOR under Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter. If this question is approved, the total existing sales and use tax rate of 2.1% established in the City Code will be increased by 4/10% (four pennies on a \$10 purchase) dedicated to public safety uses set forth above to make an effective sales and use tax rate of 2.5% as of January 1, 2002. This tax will not affect purchases of food for domestic

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B4 (cont)**

Question: B4 (cont)

home consumption, prescriptions, residential utility bills and other items as detailed in the City Code. This increase in sales and use tax will be placed in a dedicated fund and will not replace local funds already budgeted for public safety operations.

**FUNDING WILL BE DEDICATED TO PUBLIC SAFETY PERSONNEL, EQUIPMENT, OPERATIONS, AND FACILITIES TO INCLUDE:**

**Fire Service Personnel/Equipment/Operations**

- \* Three additional fire stations and necessary staff and equipment, two new aerial truck companies, and relocation of a fire station to optimize deployment. (60 Firefighters)
- \* Provide paramedic services from all fire stations.
- \* Fire prevention personnel to improve building safety and provide life safety information.
- \* Upgrade city's weather and flood alert system and dispatch notification system for fire stations.
- \* Wildfire prevention and risk reduction program in city neighborhoods.

**Police Service Personnel/Equipment/Operations**

- \* Additional patrol officers to improve emergency police response times and enhance traffic safety such as road rage and red light runners. (83 Uniformed Police Personnel)
- \* Construct a northeast police substation including staffing, operations, and maintenance. (24 Uniformed Police Personnel)
- \* Relocate Gold Hill substation to improve police operations.
- \* Technology and system upgrades for enhanced crime, accident, and call-for-service information.
- \* Additional investigative services for major accidents, street drug enforcement, crime scenes and evidence, and internal accountability. (10 Uniformed Police Personnel)

**Public Safety Capital Improvement Projects**

Fire Training Tower ; Police Helicopter Hangar, Phase II ; Police Evidence Building, Phase II ; Police Substation - 4th Division Northeast; Fire Operations and Training Center, Phase II ; Fire Station #14 Relocation ; Fire Station #19 ; Acacia Park Community Services Facility ; Police Substation - Gold Hill Division ; Fire Station #20 ; Fire Station #21; Fire Station #6 Renovation ; Fire Station #8 Renovation ; Fire Station #1 Renovation ; Fire Station Health, Safety and Accessibility Compliance Study ; Ventilation Improvement in Fire Stations ; Fire Station #17, Phase II ; Fire Department Maintenance and Logistics Center Upgrade ; Police Substation 5th Division - Land Acquisition ; Fire Station - Land Acquisition

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Year	Fiscal Year Spending (FYS)	Federal Funds
1998 actual	\$ 185,768,709	\$ 21,032,324
1999 actual	\$ 190,697,485	\$ 24,521,869
2000 actual	\$ 182,134,775	\$ 23,118,181
2001 estimate	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 22,000,000
Overall dollar change to FYS (1997-2001)		\$ 18,584,464
Overall percentage change to FYS (1997-2001)		10.24%
Overall dollar change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		\$ 25,924,817
Overall percentage change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		13.22%
Estimated annual dollar amount of new tax increase		\$ 26,976,000
Estimated FYS without tax increase		\$ 200,000,000
Estimated FYS plus federal funds without tax increase		\$ 222,000,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B4 will build 3 new fire stations, 2 new police stations and will renovate several existing fire stations.
- \* Question B4 will ensure that we do not have to close down existing fire stations to staff new ones.
- \* Question B4 will provide many firefighters and police to staff these fire and police stations, providing protection to our community.
- \* Question B4 will provide resources and staffing so that our firefighters and police can do their jobs, protecting our lives and property.
- \* Question B4 will help our firefighters and police to be safe on their jobs as they protect us. Our public safety people deserve our loyalty and respect.
- \* I am glad this question does not sunset because I do not want to have to choose whether to fire our police and firefighters at the end of the tax.
- \* Question B4 will benefit every Colorado Springs neighborhood and every resident citywide by reducing emergency response times.
- \* Question B4 will enhance traffic safety and enforcement to help reduce road rage and red light runners.
- \* Question B4 will help keep the crime rate low in Colorado Springs. Additional officers are required to do pro-active prevention of crime.
- \* Question B4 will provide wildfire prevention for city neighborhoods.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B4 (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- \* Question B4 is the product of the citizen-led Springs Community Improvement Program 01 process, in which hundreds of City residents identified, reviewed and prioritized the most pressing needs for the City.
- \* Citizens have selected what projects and what public safety needs should be funded.
- \* Question B4 proposes a very specific list of projects and public safety services to be addressed. It does not provide a blank check for city government. A citizen's oversight committee will ensure that the funds are spent appropriately.
- \* This new money will not pay for higher salaries for city employees or the city manager. Their salaries will remain well below those for comparable cities.
- \* Question B4 will provide no salary for city council members or the mayor. Our City Council is asking for less sales tax than they did in April; I can manage this amount.
- \* Before asking for a tax increase, our City Council cut expenses out of the general fund budget and found new revenue sources such as new fees that developers must pay. Other new fees include more severe fines for people breaking traffic laws.
- \* The sales and use tax increase for B4 would amount to 4/10 of one cent—just 4 cents on a \$10 purchase—and it would not be charged on purchases of food items at grocery stores, prescription medicines, gasoline or residential utility bills. Also, a large portion would be paid by tourists and other non-residents instead of city residents.
- \* Colorado Springs' local sales tax rate is the lowest effective rate among the 10 largest Colorado Front-Range cities.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* A 20% general sales tax hike, allegedly for police and fire services. Ha. This new money, \$27,000,000.00 in 2002, more thereafter, is a 13% budget increase, plus their normal 6-7%. It is forever. Vote no on B4.
- \* All B4 does is divert money now spent in those areas, to go to pay raises, waste. Council claims B4 will not replace funds already budgeted for police and fire. But budgets only last one year; no money is budgeted yet for 2002. See how tricky they are?
- \* Despite emotional appeal, B4 is not needed. Since 1991, the number of police officers grew 20% faster than population. Burglaries are down 13% just this year. 90% of fire department calls are not for fires, but accidents, CPR relief, etc. which contracted ambulances can handle. The budget is 85% above 1992's—91/2% yearly. That is enough.
- \* Council subsidizes developers (who make political donations) for growth they cause. Then taxpayers provide these extra services; that is wrong. Send a message—growth must pay its own way.
- \* We vetoed this huge sales tax hike three times already. In 1984, the council imposed a temporary 0.5% sales tax for capital improvements. Of course, they kept extending it. They also diverted all pre-existing spending on capital improvements to their pay raises. In 1991, by citizen petition and election, that tax was slowly phased out. In 1993, the city tried reinstating it, and lost by a bigger margin. This April, they tried 0.9% and lost even bigger. Now they abandon the pretense it was for capital improvements. They are trying new buzzwords – police and fire services. But it is the same tax ending in the same place – their pockets.
- \* The city controller says the \$370,000,000.00 police and fire fund had \$50,000,000.00 more than it needs to pay future pensions. The city gambled it away on the stock market. Until now, the fund's existence was unlisted in financial reports. How many other secret slush funds are there?
- \* 10 years ago, the city demolished a 25 year old police station, building a new headquarters, supposedly solving police needs for decades. Now it is inadequate. Similar demands come from the fire department. Our police chief came from Los Angeles, but we cannot afford an L.A.P.D. sized bureaucracy. Since 1996, 95% of new employees went to police and fire; 2/3rds of employees are police and fire. That is enough.
- \* Council accepted the 100,000 cops federal subsidy. Now it is gone. Council wants us to pay for their short-sighted hiring, participating in an unconstitutional program, and feeding at the federal trough.
- \* Council members pushing this tax owe their election to police and fire union bosses. B4 is political payback. The other IOU, unionized collective bargaining, will also bust the budget. We never lack job applicants, so salary and benefits must be attractive now.
- \* B4 using your heart, use your head. Vote no on B4.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B5**

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Ave., Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B5 (cont)**

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B5

SHALL CITY TAXES BE INCREASED \$6,744,000 ANNUALLY BY LEVYING A 1/10% SALES/USE TAX FOR PUBLIC WORKS/ TRANSPORTATION/ ROAD MAINTENANCE/ EQUIPMENT CAPITAL/ OPERATING NEEDS AND CONSTITUTING VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to increase its sales and use tax rate by 1/10% (one penny on a \$10 purchase) to fund public works/transportation/road maintenance personnel, equipment and operations, including necessary internal support, to improve the condition of City streets and improve traffic congestion and safety as recommended by the Citizens' Coordination Committee of the Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP 01) and as approved by City Council, and without limiting the collection or spending of any other revenues or funds by the City under TABOR, Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter, and without the increase being subject to TABOR under Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter. If this question is approved, the existing sales and use tax rate of 2.1% established in the City Code will be increased by 1/10% (one penny on a \$10 purchase) dedicated to public works/transportation/road maintenance uses set forth above to make an effective sales and use tax rate of 2.2% as of January 1, 2002. This tax will not affect purchases of food for domestic home consumption, prescriptions, residential utility bills and other items as detailed in the City Code. This increase in sales and use tax will be placed in a dedicated fund and will not replace local funds already budgeted for public works/transportation/road maintenance operations.

**FUNDING WILL BE DEDICATED TO PERSONNEL, EQUIPMENT, AND OPERATIONS TO INCLUDE:**

- \* Additional funds allocated to enhance the street overlay, pothole patching, and resurfacing program. (21 additional personnel)
- \* Expanded intersection safety and congestion mitigation efforts. (24 additional personnel)
- \* Resources allocated to enhance traffic signal synchronization and provide additional longer life pavement markings. (2 additional personnel)
- \* Additional resources for street and bridge maintenance including snow removal to improve roadway safety. (8 additional personnel)
- \* Additional streetlights and replacement of streetlights to meet citywide needs.
- \* Three year express bus program to help mitigate traffic congestion.
- \* Additional stormwater drainage maintenance. (8 additional personnel)

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Year	Fiscal Year Spending (FYS)	Federal Funds
1997 actual	\$ 181,415,536	\$ 14,659,647
1998 actual	\$ 185,768,709	\$ 21,032,324
1999 actual	\$ 190,697,485	\$ 24,521,869
2000 actual	\$ 182,134,775	\$ 23,118,181
2001 estimate	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 22,000,000
Overall dollar change to FYS (1997-2001)		\$ 18,584,464
Overall percentage change to FYS (1997-2001)		10.24%
Overall dollar change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		\$ 25,924,817
Overall percentage change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		13.22%
Estimated annual dollar amount of new tax increase		\$ 6,744,000
Estimated FYS without tax increase		\$ 200,000,000
Estimated FYS plus federal funds without tax increase		\$ 222,000,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B5 will hire people to fix what bugs me most: potholes and other road problems.
- \* Question B5 will provide staffing to finally make a dent in all the roads that need to be resurfaced. We need better roads and it takes people to make that happen.
- \* Question B5 provides staffing to get our traffic lights synchronized. I am glad I will not have to wait too long at lights.
- \* Question B5 will provide additional streetlights and replace bad streetlights all over town.
- \* Question B5 will provide no salary for city council members or the mayor.
- \* Our City Council is asking for less sales tax than they did in April; I can manage this amount.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B5 (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- \* Before asking for a tax increase, our City Council cut expenses out of the general fund budget and found new revenue sources such as new fees that developers must pay. Other new fees include more severe fines for people breaking traffic laws.
- \* The sales and use tax increase for B5 would amount to 1/10 of one cent-just 1 cents on a \$10 purchase-and it would not be charged on purchases of food items at grocery stores, prescription medicines, gasoline or residential utility bills. Also, a large portion would be paid by tourists and other non-residents instead of city residents.
- \* I support this investment in my community. Just 1 cent on a \$10 purchase. I can clip out coupons from the newspaper to make up for that easily.
- \* Colorado Springs' local sales tax rate is the lowest effective rate among the 10 largest Colorado Front-Range cities.
- \* The Colorado Springs system has virtually the same number of buses on the road today (42) as in 1979 (40) while our population has grown by 166%, and the city has spread out. It has been shown that as a city's population doubles, vehicle miles traveled triples. New express buses will help relieve congestion. Based on the success of this system in other communities, express buses in Colorado Springs could take 340,000 cars off the road annually. Fewer cars on the road means an improvement in air quality and overall quality of life for everyone.
- \* An improved transit system could also reduce the number of unsafe drivers on the road who have revoked or suspended licenses but who drive anyway because they have no other way of getting to work. Providing an option to driving while under the influence might also reduce the number of D.U.I.'s.
- \* A better bus system improves the quality of life of the many people in our community who must rely on the bus to get to work, to shop, go to the doctor, and simply get around our community.
- \* Survey's Indicate for every \$1 invested in transit, a return of \$3 to \$4 is realized in new jobs, new development, and increased property values. Invest in quality of life, vote yes on ballot question B5.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* A 5% general sales tax hike, allegedly for public works. Ha. This tax, \$6,700,000.00 in 2002, more thereafter, is added to normal 10% yearly sales tax increases. It is forever. Vote no on B5.
- \* We are in recession, at war. Stock markets are sliding. The state is cutting construction spending. This is the worst time for more boondoggles. They will be harder to fund as the economy shrinks.
- \* The budget director confirmed a citizen complaint that sales between \$5-10 had sales tax rounded up to the next penny. Therefore, it is misleading to call B5 one penny on a \$10 purchase when it is on a \$5 purchase. Council then intentionally let that falsehood remain in the ballot text to deceive voters.
- \* B5 will divert money now spent on public works, to go to pay raises, waste. Council claims B5 will not replace funds already budgeted. But budgets are yearly; no money is budgeted yet for 2002. Tricky?
- \* There is no deadline on listed construction; promises are unenforceable.
- \* The budget is 85% above 1992's-91/2% yearly. That is enough.
- \* Our empty buses lose \$6,000,000.00 yearly. B5's solution? More buses. That is crazy.
- \* Do not hire 21 employees filling potholes-transfer six public relations employees and 15 bureaucrats. Stop spending on consultants and studies. Stop the \$150,000 Platte/Nevada statue scandal. Cut millions in subsidies to city gymnasiums-ice rinks-pools-art districts. Sell surplus property-auditorium, job training center, shopping center. Stop bulldozing \$450,000 properties and selling \$4,500,000.00 acreage for a dollar. The citizens' SCIP Finance Committee detailed in 8 pages how to save \$35,000,000.00 yearly (five times the B5 tax).
- \* These projects are traditional city responsibilities. Why reward years of city neglect? Last year, the city intentionally underspent police, fire and public works budgets, to cynically contribute to this image of crisis.
- \* The alleged backlog rose over \$300,000,000.00 in three years. The mayor admitted it is a wish list. B5 cannot touch needs mounting \$100,000,000.00 yearly. It is all scam.
- \* Council subsidizes developers (who make political donations) for growth they cause. Then taxpayers provide these extra services; that is wrong. Send a message-growth must pay its own way.
- \* We vetoed this sales tax hike three times already. In 1984, the council imposed a temporary 0.5% sales tax for capital improvements. They kept extending it. They also diverted all pre-existing spending on capital improvements to their pay raises. In 1991, by citizen petition and election, that tax was slowly phased out. In 1993, reinstatement lost by a bigger margin. This April, 0.9% lost even bigger. B5 is the same pretext, ending in the same place-their pockets. To save money? Stop wasting election costs on unpopular ballot issues rejected three times.
- \* The city controller just disclosed a \$370,000,000.00 fund, previously unlisted in financial reports. How many other secret slush funds are there?
- \* Do not be fooled. No on B5.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B6**

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B6

SHALL CITY TAXES BE INCREASED \$6,744,000 ANNUALLY BY LEVYING 1/10% SALES/USE TAX FOR PARKS/RECREATION PROJECTS TO TERMINATE END OF YEAR 2007 AND CONSTITUTING A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to increase its sales and use tax rate by 1/10% (one penny on a \$10 purchase) for six years to fund the parks and recreation capital improvements as recommended by the Citizens' Coordination Committee of the Springs Community Improvements Program (SCIP 01) and as approved by City Council, and without limiting the collection or spending of any other revenues or funds by the City under TABOR, Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter, and without the increase being subject to TABOR under Article X, Section 20 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 7-90 of the City Charter. If this question is approved, the existing sales and use tax rate of 2.1% established in the City Code will be increased by 1/10% (one penny on a \$10 purchase) dedicated to fund parks and recreation improvements as set forth above to make an effective sales and use tax rate of 2.2% as of January 1, 2002. This tax will sunset exactly six years from the date of its implementation and will not affect purchases of food for domestic home consumption, prescriptions, residential utility bills and other items as detailed in the City Code. This increase in sales and use tax will be placed in a dedicated fund to be used only for funding the design, project management, construction, and any necessary land acquisition for the capital improvement projects listed below. The projects listed below will be constructed to the extent that revenues from the increase in the sales and use tax are sufficient to complete the projects.

**Parks and Recreation Capital Improvement Projects**

Northwest (Wilson Ranch Park) Recreation Center, Phase II - Gymnasiums and Indoor Pool ; Aquatics and Fitness Center at Memorial Park, Phase II - Gymnasium Completion ; El Pomar Youth Sports Complex Lighting - Baseball and Soccer Fields ; Sertich Ice Center at Memorial Park, Phase II - Second Ice Sheet ; Pioneers Museum Renovation - Exhibit Space and Climate Control ; North (Briargate) Sports Complex - Baseball and Soccer Fields ; Southeast Recreation Center, Phase II - Joint YMCA Facility ; Northeast (Cottonwood) Recreation Center/Pool Complex, Phase II - Gymnasiums and Fitness Center ; Pikes Peak Greenway - Trails, Bridges, Bank Reclamation ; Stetson Hills Outdoor Family Pool ; Southwest Outdoor Family Pool

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

Year	Fiscal Year Spending (FYS)	Federal Funds
1997 actual	\$ 181,415,536	\$ 14,659,647
1998 actual	\$ 185,768,709	\$ 21,032,324
1999 actual	\$ 190,697,485	\$ 24,521,869
2000 actual	\$ 182,134,775	\$ 23,118,181
2001 estimate	\$ 200,000,000	\$ 22,000,000
Overall dollar change to FYS (1997-2001)		\$ 18,584,464
Overall percentage change to FYS (1997-2001)		10.24%
Overall dollar change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		\$ 25,924,817
Overall percentage change to FYS plus federal funds (1997-2001)		13.22%
Estimated annual dollar amount of new tax increase		\$ 6,744,000
Estimated FYS without tax increase		\$ 200,000,000
Estimated FYS plus federal funds without tax increase		\$ 222,000,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B6 is just one of the seven choices that the city has provided me. Things are getting better at City Hall. I appreciate having a choice, and I am voting yes.
- \* I think of recreation centers and parks as being very important to our community. Children and families need safe places to play.

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B6 (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

- \* Recreation is ultimately an investment in public safety and quality of life; kids who have safe places to play with supervision are less likely to grow up taking the wrong path.
- \* The sales and use tax increase for B6 would amount to 1/10 of one cent – just 1 cent on a \$10 purchase – and it would not be charged on purchases of food items at grocery stores, prescription medicines, gasoline or residential utility bills. Also, a large portion would be paid by tourists and other non-residents instead of city residents.
- \* Providing ball field and soccer field lighting for the El Pomar Youth Sports Park will allow an increase by one-third of the available playing time for kids at this facility. Currently the facility far exceeds anticipated usage.
- \* Adding a second sheet of ice at the Sertich Ice Center will allow youth hockey and young figure skaters to practice during reasonable daytime hours and not late at night.
- \* The Briargate Sports Complex will provide much needed youth game and practice facilities in the fast growing northeast quadrant of Colorado Springs.
- \* All proposed projects are designed to serve kids, families and seniors; no “special” facilities just for one group of people are being built.
- \* The projects are evenly distributed across the community, not just located in one neighborhood or subdivision.
- \* Several projects represent joint ventures with other community agencies, thus stretching the public’s investment in recreation facilities.
- \* The Pioneers Museum is the city’s only link to Colorado Springs’ rich historical past and is in desperate need of heating/cooling systems.
- \* The Phase II projects will complete the work on recreation centers started two years ago. All but one of the Phase I components are completed or are scheduled to be completed by March, 2002.
- \* The two outdoor family fun pools will bring inexpensive water fun areas to two areas of the community (Stetson Hills and Southwest) that have no public accessible pool facilities.
- \* The 1/10% sales tax will end in exactly six years...it will not go on forever.
- \* All money collected by this tax will only go for these eleven projects. It will not fund employee salaries, bonuses, raises, or other operating costs.
- \* All land on which these projects are to be built is either currently owned or will be donated to the city for recreational purposes.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* A 5% general sales tax hike, allegedly for parks. Ha. This tax, \$6,700,000.00 in 2002, more thereafter, is added to normal 10% yearly sales tax increases. Vote no on B6.
- \* The budget director confirmed a citizen complaint that sales between \$5-10 had sales tax rounded up to the next penny. Therefore, it is misleading to call B6 one penny on a \$10 purchase when it is on a \$5 purchase. Council then intentionally let that falsehood remain in the ballot text to deceive voters.
- \* There is no deadline on listed construction; promises are unenforceable. No project is guaranteed, no costs stated. Where is the maintenance money coming from. Another tax increase?
- \* The Parks Department loses millions yearly. It is 85% tax-subsidized. Users pay only 15%. That is backwards.
- \* Gymnasiums, pools, ice skating, fitness, culture-these activities remove more land from tax rolls and compete unfairly with private business. Many activities cost more than they collect; they are unjustified by market forces.
- \* The citizens’ SCIP Finance Committee detailed an 8 page report showing how to save \$35,000,000.00 yearly (five times the B6 tax).
- \* These projects are low priorities. Council put B6 on the ballot as a throw-away, to offer one temporary tax you could reject. Their plan is to manipulate you into backing the larger permanent taxes. That’s a false choice. We should reject all seven ballot issues.
- \* Their alleged project backlog rose over \$300,000,000.00 in three years. The mayor admitted it is a wish list. B6 cannot touch needs mounting \$100,000,000.00 yearly. It is all a scam.
- \* We vetoed this sales tax hike three times already. In 1984, the council imposed a temporary 0.5% sales tax for capital improvements. They kept extending it. They also diverted all pre-existing spending on capital improvements to their pay raises. In 1991, by citizen petition and election, that tax was slowly phased out. In 1993, reinstatement lost by a bigger margin. This April, 0.9% lost even bigger. B6 is the same pretext, ending in the same place – their pockets. To save money? Stop wasting election costs on unpopular ballot issues rejected three times.
- \* Kids do not need to spend time learning sports and teamwork; they should be taught the value of hard work at an early age to support their families.
- \* We could put ground to better use than play fields and recreation centers. Let us build more housing and strip malls on these parcels.
- \* It is not necessary to equally distribute recreation facilities around the community. Parents should be willing to drive around town if their kids are really that important to them.
- \* A 1/10% sales tax is outrageous. That is 10 cents on every \$100.00 I spend. People will not be able to save up money for a new car or college.

CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B7

Designated Election Official:

Kathryn M. Young, CMC  
City Clerk  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 101  
P.O. Box 1575, MC 110  
Colorado Springs, CO 80901-1575  
(719) 385-5901

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B7

SHALL THE CITY SAVE APPROXIMATELY \$30,000 PER TABOR ELECTION BY MAILING ONE ELECTION NOTICE (INSTEAD OF TWO) TO ELECTORS BY CHANGING THE CITY CHARTER SECTION 7-90(c)(2) TO READ IN PART: “THE CITY SHALL MAIL AT THE LOWEST COST ONE (1) NOTICE OR ONE (1) SET OF NOTICES TITLED, AS APPROPRIATE, ‘NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES/TO INCREASE DEBT/ON A CITIZEN PETITION/ON A REFERRED MEASURE’ ADDRESSED TO ‘ALL REGISTERED VOTERS’ AT EACH MAILING ADDRESS OF ONE (1) OR MORE REGISTERED ELECTORS” IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TIME REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN COLORADO CONSTITUTION ARTICLE X, SECTION 20(3)(b) AS AMENDED?

If approved, the City of Colorado Springs shall be authorized to mail only one set of TABOR election notices per TABOR election to each mailing address of one or more registered electors. In general or coordinated elections, the TABOR election notice will generally be forwarded to the County Clerk to be included with those TABOR notices from other jurisdictions. In the April City election, one notice or set of TABOR election notices will be mailed to each address of one or more registered electors by the City. By mailing only one set of TABOR election notices, instead of two now required due to different mailing dates set forth in the City Charter and Colorado Constitution, the City will save approximately \$30,000 per TABOR election.

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Question B7 will not require new taxes. This question is a way to save at least \$30,000 in taxpayer money in each election.
- \* I know my city will continue to comply with state law to send out notification of ballot issues. That is good enough for me.
- \* Question B7 is just one of the seven choices that the city has provided me. Things are getting better at City Hall. I appreciate having a choice and I am voting yes.
- \* It is a waste of money for the city to have to send Taxpayer’s Bill of Rights notices twice before an election. No other city in Colorado is forced to do this. We can save lots of money this way.
- \* We do not need more than one notice of the election; we are smart enough to figure out what we need and support.
- \* The author of TABOR wants to force us to send out two notices. He wants to use \$30,000 in public money for his personal anti-government platforms. No way. This is our election and our ballot.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* B7 is a trick. Voters rejected this information suppression scheme in 1999, but the city is badgering us again. Vote no on B7.
- \* The September 21<sup>st</sup> Metro section newspaper article revealed the city’s mistake. Council did not even write this charter amendment the way they intended. The city attorney admitted the language is bungled. As written, B7 not only cancels an informative mailing, like this, to city voters, but repeals any charter deadline on mailing any election notice to voters. If B7 passes, no charter language will prevent mailings three months before the election, or one week after. Unbelievable, but true.
- \* A citizen brought this error to their attention at a public council meeting in August. Council and the city attorney refused to admit they were wrong and to change the punctuation to include the language that the city now agrees has been left out of their amendment. Do you really want to reward these arrogant illiterates on Election Day by giving away your right to voter information?
- \* The city attorney has admitted that another election would be required to amend the charter to correct this serious error in B7. Why pay that extra cost when we can just defeat B7 now?
- \* If the city cannot write one sentence correctly on the ballot, can you trust their judgment on the need for what they thought was their charter amendment? No. Can you trust their judgment and scrutiny on budget matters or spending priorities?
- \* The city improperly listed its argument of alleged cost savings in the ballot title. The title is required to be neutral, but they violated the law and distorted the issue by claiming this is a vote on saving money. Nonsense. It is a vote on changing the charter and taking away voter information mailing now required.

**CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS  
QUESTION B7 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* Claiming city concern about \$30,000 (eight cents per citizen) when asking for \$40,000,000.00 in first-year taxes is ludicrous and hypocritical.
- \* Even if B7 were not miswritten, it is a bad idea. State mailings are made at least thirty days before the election, so they could be 40-50-60 days before, which is long before many voters are aware of or interested in the election. Timely notices are more likely to be read.
- \* A city election notice closer to the election allows comments on events that happen after the state deadline. Revelations of scandal, wasteful spending, etc. cannot be the subject of timely comments if the comment deadline has passed.
- \* A last minute filing of comments for the first election notice may contain false statements. The city mailing allows a rebuttal by commenting citizens to those misleading or deceptive remarks, particularly if made by government officials themselves.
- \* The city says state law will resolve their error. But state law can change any time. We need to protect city voter rights in the city charter. B7 takes away our rights. Vote no on B7.

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN  
QUESTION B8**

Designated Election Official:

Sharon G. Mosley  
City Clerk  
116 South Main Street  
Fountain, Colorado 80817

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF FOUNTAIN  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B8

WITH NO NEW TAX AND NO INCREASE IN ANY TAX RATE WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF CITY VOTERS PURSUANT TO THIS QUESTION, SHALL THE CITY OF FOUNTAIN BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED IN 2000, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$399,228 OVER THE LIMIT IMPOSED BY ARTICLE X, SECTION 20(7) OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION FOR THE PURPOSES OF REPAIRING SELECTED EXISTING CITY STREETS, CURB AND GUTTER AND STORM WATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES WITHOUT FURTHER VOTER APPROVAL, NOTWITHSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* Taking away \$400,000 in estimated city tax refunds is a \$400,000 tax increase. Vote "NO" on issue B8
- \* In this time of war and recession, government must leave money in the private sector to revive the economy.
- \* This issue is too vague. It does not describe projects exactly. If their need for our money is so urgent, why couldn't they say what we would get for our money. They just want it because they think they deserve it more than the people who earned it do. This issue does not guarantee MORE spending in any area; they can divert existing revenue and spend it elsewhere, on things you dislike.
- \* Colorado Springs' sales tax rate is 30% less than ours. We have higher property taxes. We are overtaxed. That's why we have a refund. The city should cut taxes, not try to take our tax refunds.
- \* The mayor and another council member voted against keeping our refunds. The mayor said roadwork should come from the normal budget, not our tax refunds. He is right. The basics should come first, not be treated as optional "extras" and held hostage to our giving up our legal right to tax refunds.
- \* Sales tax revenue was up 22% in 2000, and is up 17 percent more this year. That's too much.
- \* Other governments are refunding excess revenue; why can't Fountain? You get tax refunds only by voting "NO." Fountain will pay us to vote "NO."
- \* City revenue is not frozen, but automatically increases for growth plus inflation. Voting "NO" lets families share in excess revenue above normal increases.
- \* The city wants a blank check. It wants it all, thinking it can spend your money better than you can.

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN  
QUESTION B8 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* Has city spending risen faster than your income? Why bring back the bad old days of unlimited spending, more bureaucracy, more regulations, less freedom? Vote "NO."
- \* What about city use of existing revenue, and wasteful spending: Why hand our money yearly to insider groups and money-losing activities? If the basics came first, they wouldn't need our refunds. Voting "NO" will force review of city budget priorities.
- \* We must make hard choices politicians won't. Government can't do everything for everyone.
- \* Tax refunds help the economy-more money in the private sector means more jobs. Taxes are almost 50% of income now; saving one tax dollar equals a \$2 pay raise. You can return your tax refund, but don't take it away from low-income and senior citizens.
- \* Have they considered all alternatives to taking more of our money?
- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better-you or some bureaucrat?
- \* Enough is enough! We need tax relief.
- \* Reject unlimited spending without accountability to taxpayers. Make Fountain live on a budget, not a blank check. Get your tax refund. Vote "NO" on issue B8.

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B9**

Designated Election Official:

Carol A. Lawson  
City Clerk  
606 Manitou Avenue  
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B9

SHALL MANITOU SPRINGS DEBT BE INCREASED \$810,000.00 DOLLARS, WITH AN ESTIMATED TOTAL MAXIMUM REPAYMENT OF \$1,349,000.00 DOLLARS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS ALONG PORTIONS OF RUXTON, MANITOU AND CANON AVENUES, AND, TO PROVIDE FOR THE PARTIAL PAYMENT OF SAID DEBT, SHALL MANITOU SPRINGS TAXES BE INCREASED BY THE ADDITION OF A 0.15% SALES TAX, COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2002, AND ESTIMATED TO RAISE \$64,527.00 IN 2002 AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER THROUGH 2021, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND EXPENDED BY THE CITY WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY EXPENDITURE, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$ 3,734,957
2000 (actual)	\$ 3,581,243
1999 (actual)	\$ 3,248,275
1998 (actual)	\$ 2,964,892
1997 (actual)	\$ 2,771,575

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 26%  
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 963,382

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002: \$ 64,527  
Estimated 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 3,975,803

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 890,138
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 143,365
Total repayment cost:	\$ 1,136,590

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 810,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 67,499
Total Repayment cost:	\$ 1,349,000

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Undergrounding of utilities has been a priority for Manitou Springs residents for many years. It was suggested in a 1978 study, in 1995 in the Rainbow Vision

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B9 (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

Plan and in 1999 in the Avenue Plan. Residents also named it as a top priority during the Economic Summit in the Fall of 2000. Finally the City is in a position to be able to improve the visual look of Manitou Springs. The utility poles will be buried on both sides of the street from Pawnee Avenue to just past Ruxton Avenue, on Canon Avenue from Manitou Avenue to the Cliff House, and in the first block of Ruxton Avenue. The poles at the East Gateway will also be buried allowing the Gateway Arch to be re-installed. Without undergrounding, the arch will never be able to be replaced due to Colorado Springs Utilities/OSHA requirements.

The sales tax increase of .15% amounts to 15 cents on 10 dollars. This would raise our sales tax from 7.5% to 7.65%. It was previously at 7.8% and didn't keep away tourists. Other mountain towns have a much higher sales tax than Manitou Springs. Colorado Springs has spent a lot of money on improvements downtown. Old Colorado City was improved in the 70's. Woodland Park has improved their downtown. This program will provide 53 historic streetlights and eliminate all of the unsightly wires overhead. We need this in order to be competitive. If there is more money generated than needed to complete the areas listed then more of the wires can be undergrounded.

Manitou Springs residents have no alternative to Colorado Springs Utilities for gas and electric. Colorado Springs Utilities will be paying 50% of the undergrounding costs out of a fund created just for this purpose. We value our open space and views of the mountains, this is our opportunity to make the views that much more spectacular.

With questions about the economy, we need to support our businesses and complete these improvements so we can continue to attract visitors. A travel guide called Manitou Springs shabby. WE need to change those perceptions. Approximately 65% of the City budget comes from sales tax revenue. If visitors stop coming to Manitou, we risk having to pay higher property taxes for basic services like police and fire.

With interest rates being lowered, now is the time to take advantage of them and use the money borrowed in an investment that will benefit the community. We can't allow our infrastructure to crumble. Leaning utility poles are ugly. The new banners will be able to be used on the new historic streetlights. The new curb bump out and planting area in front of the Stagecoach looks so nice. We need more of these areas at all of the crosswalks to improve pedestrian safety.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

The undergrounding project should include all of Manitou Avenue. It is unfair to business owners to miss out on this opportunity.

This is \$1.35 million in deficit spending. \$539,000 in interest payments, which won't make any repairs. Deficit spending is immoral. We spend the money and our children must pay it back.

When on the verge of recession and war, we should not be raising taxes. It will hurt the economy, burden low-income and senior citizens the most and take money from greater spending priorities. If this is a basic need, it should be part of their regular budget, now filled with wasteful spending, high salaries, and frills.

Read the ballot title carefully. It just says "capital improvement projects." It doesn't say what they are. Any oral political promises are not legally binding. They can spend the money on anything along those streets. Why so vague? The Taxpayer's Bill of Rights specifies the opening wording of tax and debt increase issues. The city violated TABOR and did not use required language for either tax or debt increases, which it sneakily packaged into one measure. Why? This ballot issue is illegal and should lose. The city can come back and ask again when it agrees to obey the constitution.

The tax increase is only for the "partial payment of said debt." What else will the \$64,527 tax increase be used for? Why not tell us? If the city needs MORE than that major tax increase to pay the debt, what programs will be cut to pay it? This is a 20-year tax increase. Once they borrow the money, we can't change our minds. The city should pay cash and do the job as they can afford it. The city says it "doesn't have sufficient funds on hand." That shows fiscal irresponsibility. If they are "broke," should they be piling up debt on our credit card?

The tax will continue for 20 years, even if the debt is paid off sooner. Note 20 years times today's tax, WITHOUT INFLATION, is \$1.29 million. At 5% yearly growth, it will be much more than the debt. What will the tax increase pay for then? B9 also allows the tax to exceed the \$64,527 voters approve, even though the law says they must list the "dollar amount" the tax will raise "annually," which means year after year, or each year. In eight years, this tax could be \$100,000 yearly.

In their rush to raise taxes, the council didn't even proofread the wording! In two places, it says "810,000 dollars" and "\$1,349,000 dollars," using both the word and the dollar sign. They should have taken the time to investigate alternatives. They want this money "without regard to any...limitation contained within...the Colorado Constitution," which they took an oath to uphold. Is that responsible? Is that honest?

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B9 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

Manitou Springs already has a high sales tax rate. Raising it will drive tourists and other customers to other cities to shop. Vote NO on B9.

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B10

Designated Election Official:

Carol A. Lawson  
City Clerk  
606 Manitou Avenue  
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B10

SHALL MANITOU SPRINGS TAXES BE INCREASED BY APPROXIMATELY \$43,018.00 IN 2008 AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER THROUGH 2020, BY EXTENDING THE 0.1% SALES TAX PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING FUNDS TO BE USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR ACQUISITION AND CARE OF LANDS, FOR PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE, NEW PARKS AND SCENIC VISTAS IN AND AROUND THE CITY, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND EXPENDED BY THE CITY WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY EXPENDITURE, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$ 3,734,957
2000 (actual)	\$ 3,581,243
1999 (actual)	\$ 3,248,275
1998 (actual)	\$ 2,964,892
1997 (actual)	\$ 2,771,575

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 26%  
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 963,382

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2008: \$ 43,018  
Estimated 2008 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 5,420,879

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

**What does this ballot issue do?** This ballot issue extends the present 0.1% sales tax in Manitou Springs, which is 1 cent for each \$10 purchase. It will be used to enhance the work being done by our volunteers and our City in preserving our mountains, purchasing parkland and building trails that make this a special place to live. It will provide funding that may enable the purchase of large key open space properties. It will sunset (expire) in the year 2020.

**Why should we extend now?** We are fortunate to live in one of the most beautiful, scenic places in America, it may not remain that way for long. Hillside, ridgeline and mountaintop development outside our city limits and beyond our control will increasingly blight our scenic backdrop. Unless we act now to take further steps to save our setting, it will be gone. The only way to really deal with unwise development is to buy the land outright or buy conservation easements. Attempted regulation is not the right policy and does not work in the long run. With the dramatic growth in the Pikes Peak region, land prices have increased fivefold since 1995, making future purchase of large remaining chunks of our mountains impossible unless we extend the open space taxes.

**What have we done with the tax money you approved in 1995?** We have had several successes since 1995, when the open space taxes passed overwhelmingly. The Open Space Plan has been developed through an extensive public input process. The top of Red Mountain, scenic overlooks at Higginbotham Flats, and portions of lower Red Mountain have been purchased. Individual property owners and El Paso County have donated several open space properties in the City. Securing matching grants from Great Outdoors Colorado has maximized open space funds. In-town park space has been purchased and a network for trails has been planned.

**What are the economics of this?** Not only does blighting development look bad, but it also costs us money. The floods down Pawnee, Sutherland and Canon affected us all. Acquiring hillside lands with high open space values mitigates

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B10 (cont)

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

this risk. Blighting development also affects our tourist-based economy. We hope that visitors never say 'Why should I go to Manitou Springs, it just looks like where I live?' Further, as taxpaying residents, we should ask 'Why should I subsidize hillside development?' The public service costs to the City (taxpayer) are only partially reimbursed by the taxes received from hillside development. We pay the rest of the bill in higher taxes and/or reduced levels of service.

**What can we do about it?** It is in the best interest of all of us to invest in our community and our future by extending the present open space 0.1% sales tax. It costs our visitors and us just 1 cent for each \$10 purchase, a small price to pay for preserving the unique place we call home.

**VOTE YES on B10.**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This issue is way premature. The tax doesn't expire until 2008. Situations closer to 2008 may be very different. No one can predict future needs. We are now and may then be in a recession, war, or some other major difficulty. Why impose more taxes on those who won't get to vote on them because they won't move here, or reach age 18, for six years? Vote NO on B10.

Will the politicians put this on the ballot every election until we agree to extend it? That is voter harassment. We should resist such badgering. Don't they have better things to do than think up ways to raise our taxes before any conceivable need arises? Why vote now on a tax increase for 2018? It shows council's lack of faith in voter judgment to do the right thing in the future.

How much open space is enough in our little town? Every purchase costs us money to buy and maintain. City ownership will also reduce the tax rolls, costing money to schools and other governments, and shifting lost property taxes onto remaining owners and renters (through higher rents). That hurts low-income and senior citizens most.

The city said in issue B9 it was broke and can't afford to fix infrastructure. Isn't that a higher priority than this?

Manitou Springs already has a high sales tax rate. Keeping it high will drive tourists and other customers elsewhere to shop. That will hurt our economy even more.

B9 says a 0.15% tax raises \$64,527 in 2002. Therefore, a 0.1% tax which is 2/3rds that amount should raise 2/3<sup>rd</sup> that revenue, or \$43,000 in 2002 – next year. They are saying it will raise that amount in 2008. Do you really believe there will be no inflation or economic growth for six years? Why are they deceiving us about the cost? Don't reward dishonesty or incompetence.

The state constitution says understating or lowballing the tax cost on the ballot is illegal. B10 will force the city to lower the sales tax rate and refund the money in 2008. Do you want to pay for both sides of that lawsuit, which the city will clearly lose, plus attorney fees and interest penalties? Do you want merchants to constantly pay to change computerized cash registers?

They don't promise what land they will buy, for how much, or from whom (possible conflict of interest). This is just a blank check to exploit frustration with traffic and density. Government owns half of Colorado now. How much is enough?

The Taxpayer's Bill of Rights specifies and lists the opening wording of tax increase issues. The city violated TABOR and ignored required language for this tax increase. Nor is the dollar amount limited "annually," as required.

They want this money "without regard to any...limitation contained within...the Colorado Constitution," which they took an oath to uphold. Is that responsible? Is that honest? Vote NO on B10.

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B11

Designated Election Official:

Carol A. Lawson  
City Clerk  
606 Manitou Avenue  
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B11 (cont)

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B11

SHALL MANITOU SPRINGS TAXES BE INCREASED BY APPROXIMATELY \$26,879.00 IN 2008 AND BY WHATEVER AMOUNTS ARE RAISED ANNUALLY THEREAFTER THROUGH 2020, BY EXTENDING THE 0.8 MILS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING FUNDS TO BE USED EXCLUSIVELY FOR ACQUISITION AND CARE OF LAND, FOR PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE, NEW PARKS AND SCENIC VISTAS IN AND AROUND THE CITY, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND EXPENDED BY THE CITY WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY EXPENDITURE, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$ 3,734,957
2000 (actual)	\$ 3,581,243
1999 (actual)	\$ 3,248,275
1998 (actual)	\$ 2,964,892
1997 (actual)	\$ 2,771,575

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 26%  
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 963,382

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2008: \$ 26,879  
Estimated 2008 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 5,420,879

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

**What does this ballot issue do?** This ballot issue extends the present 0.8-mill open space property tax in Manitou Springs, which is estimated at \$14.40 per year for a \$200,000 house. It will be used to enhance the work being done by our volunteers and our City in preserving our mountains, purchasing parkland and building trails that make this a special place to live. It will provide funding that may enable the purchase of large key open space properties. It will sunset (expire) in the year 2020.

**Why should we extend now?** We are fortunate to live in one of the most beautiful, scenic places in America, it may not remain that way for long. Hillside, ridgeline and mountaintop development outside our city limits and beyond our control will increasingly blight our scenic backdrop. Unless we act now to take further steps to save our setting, it will be gone. The only way to really deal with unwise development is to buy the land outright or buy conservation easements. Attempted regulation is not the right policy and does not work in the long run. With the dramatic growth in the Pikes Peak region, land prices have increased fivefold since 1995, making future purchase of large remaining chunks of our mountains impossible unless we extend the open space taxes.

**What have we done with the tax money you approved in 1995?** We have had several successes since 1995, when the open space taxes passed overwhelmingly. The Open Space Plan has been developed through an extensive public input process. The top of Red Mountain, scenic overlooks at Higginbotham Flats, and portions of lower Red Mountain have been purchased. Individual property owners and El Paso County have donated several open space properties in the City. Securing matching grants from Great Outdoors Colorado has maximized open space funds. In-town park space has been purchased and a network for trails has been planned.

**What are the economics?** Not only does blighting development look bad, but it also costs us money. The floods down Pawnee, Sutherland and Canon affected us all. Acquiring hillside lands with high open space values mitigates this risk. Blighting development also affects our tourist-based economy. We hope that visitors never say 'Why should I go to Manitou Springs, it just looks like where I live?' Further, as taxpaying residents, we should ask 'Why should I subsidize hillside development?' The public service costs to the City (taxpayer) are only partially reimbursed by the taxes received from hillside development. We pay the rest of the bill in higher taxes and/or reduced levels of service.

**What can we do about it?** It is in the best interest of all of us to invest in our community and our future by extending the present open space 0.8-mill property tax. Paying \$14.40 a year is a small price to pay for preserving the unique and special place we call home.

**VOTE YES on B11.**

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This issue is way premature. The tax doesn't expire until 2008. Situations closer to 2008 may be very different. No one can predict future needs. We are now and may then be in a recession, war, or some other major difficulty. Why impose more taxes on those who won't even get to vote on them because they won't move here, or reach age 18, for another six years? Vote NO on B11.

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B11**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

Every purchase costs us money to buy and then to maintain. City ownership will also reduce the tax rolls, shifting the lost property taxes onto the remaining owners and renters (through higher rents). It will cost money to schools and other local governments. Add the property tax increase and it is a double whammy. Is that the way to encourage home ownership?

Isn't one tax increase for more city-owned land enough? Property taxes are regressive because they aren't based on an ability to pay. They hurt low-income and senior citizens hardest. Government owns half of Colorado right now, isn't that enough?

Their rush to raise taxes kept them from even proof-reading B11. A "mil" is a unit of length. What they meant was a "mill," which is one-tenth of a penny, the fraction used to compute property taxes. Should we give huge financial wind-falls to such sloppy amateurs who pepper their ballot demands with false dollar amounts, vague and deceptive justifications for tax increases, and even misspelled words? Embarrassing.

The title for B11 says it is for "incurring debt and increasing taxes." But the question is only a property tax increase. They couldn't even remember to include the debt mentioned in the prior sentence! Are they planning a secret, illegal debt secured by this money?

Our city property tax rate is more than 2 1/2 times that in Colorado Springs. We are not going to attract business and investment. We'll just punish homeowners with our excessive property tax level, one of the highest among Colorado cities.

Since the sales tax revenue the city stated in B10 is clearly false (see comments against B10), can we trust this is the tax amount this mill levy will raise? Even under their doubtful figures, it will be over a million dollar burden during its life, with only minimal inflation. That is too much, particularly when citizens and the city both have higher priority uses for that money.

B11 also allows the tax to exceed the \$26,879 voters approve, even though the law says they must list the "dollar amount" the tax will raise "annually," which means year after year, or each year. In eight years, this tax could be \$50,000 yearly.

Does "in and around" the city mean we'll buy land outside the city? How far do "scenic vistas" extend?

They want this money "without regard to any...limitation contained within...the Colorado Constitution," which they took an oath to uphold. Is that responsible? Is it honest? Vote NO on B11.

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B12**

Designated Election Official:

Carol A. Lawson  
City Clerk  
606 Manitou Avenue  
Manitou Springs, CO 80829

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: B12

SHALL MANITOU SPRINGS DEBT BE INCREASED \$1,100,000.00 DOLLARS, WITH AN ESTIMATED TOTAL MAXIMUM REPAYMENT OF \$1,833,300.00 DOLLARS, FOR THE REPAIR OF FLOOD DAMAGE ALONG CANON AVENUE, WITH NO INCREASE IN TAXES?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$ 3,734,957
2000 (actual)	\$ 3,581,243
1999 (actual)	\$ 3,248,275
1998 (actual)	\$ 2,964,892
1997 (actual)	\$ 2,771,575

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:	26%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$ 963,382

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002:	0
Estimated 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$ 3,975,803

**CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS  
QUESTION B12 (cont)**

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 890,138
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 143,365
Total repayment cost:	\$ 1,136,590

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$ 1,100,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 91,666
Total Repayment cost:	\$ 1,833,300

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

**What is the need?** In 1999 the City experienced a flood that did damage throughout our City. The brunt of the storm was focused along Canon Avenue, destroying a home and damaged both businesses and homes. It overwhelmed and rendered our existing storm drainage system ineffective. While Manitou Springs received financial assistance for the upper phase of the storm drain, there has been no help on the lower and most expensive phase.

**I don't live near Canon Avenue, how does it affect me?** Those that live in the Canon Avenue area know the devastation that was wrought in 1999. The U.S. mail as and the citizens of Manitou Springs, were unable to reach the Post Office, resulting in its temporary move to City Hall. Businesses and homes alike were damaged and some businesses closed. If this were to happen now, there likely would be more property damaged and businesses closed, resulting in lost revenues for the city. It does impact each of us.

**Is it necessary to borrow?** Yes! The Storm Drainage Fund provides \$70,000 per year for precisely this type of need. However, if the City waits to accumulate enough to pay for the project, it will take years. Even if some General Fund Revenues were used, it could take seven to ten years or more to set aside the amount necessary for a project of this size. In the meantime, project costs escalate and private and public assets and infrastructure remain unprotected.

**Does this increase my taxes?** No! There will not be a tax increase. The City is not asking for more money, just the ability to leverage current revenue levels to protect the private and public assets of our community. Existing revenues will be used to pay back the loan. Most of the revenue for payments will come from the Storm Drainage and Flood Management Utility Fund. This project is precisely what the fund is intended for.

**What does the project entail?** The existing drainage structure is inadequate to handle a storm of the size we had in 1999. In addition, much of the storm drain was destroyed. A new drain has been designed to handle this size storm and allow the City crews to take equipment in for cleaning. It will be relocated beneath the street, therefore requiring the moving of utilities.

This capital project is not a luxury. It goes to the core of governments responsibility to its citizens and it does so with existing funding levels. Please vote yes on B12.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

This is \$1,833 million in deficit spending. \$733,300 is interest payments, which won't make any repairs. Deficit spending is immoral. We spend the money and our children must pay it back. Our third U.S. President, the author of the Declaration of Independence, said of government debt, "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared... To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with public debt... We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or confusion and servitude... If we run into such debts, we must be taxed." Listen to the wisdom of America's great Founding Father. Then vote NO on B12.

For all four irresponsible tax and debt issues in this city, read carefully the financial data provided in the election notice. It lists the percentage and dollar increase in city revenue in the past four years and the current debt and total cost of repayment. It also shows the city revenue will grow next year, without these tax increase. Has your income risen that fast? They need to set priorities and live on a budget, not a blank check. We need to practice "tough love" with these spendaholics by voting NO.

The city intentionally did not fix the damaged area so it could use its cynical neglect to justify more deficit spending. The Council says it doesn't have the money. How much did city salaries rise in the past two years? Part of their problem is the money tied up in old debt payments! Getting the city out of debt will improve its cash flow, just as it does when citizens cut up their credit cards. The only way to get them there is to vote NO.

The city has an emergency reserve fund of 3% of its budget. It also has other reserve accounts. Why didn't the city use them and save the interest costs? If the total is not enough, the city should have had insurance. It should budget prudently and have contingency funds for such cases, just as Colorado families do. Instead, they spend every dollar they can get their hands on, then demand more. There is no excuse for their saying we have to raise taxes when it rains!

Please re-read the arguments against the other three profligate and reckless ballot demands by the city. On B12, as well as the other three, the only fiscally responsible course is for us to vote NO-NO-NO.

**HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2  
QUESTION C1**

Designated Election Official:

Bill Zalman, Secretary  
1060 Harrison Road  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906  
(719) 579-2000

**NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND DEBT  
EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2 HARRISON  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO**

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C1

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2 (HARRISON) DEBT BE INCREASED \$60,000,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$131,582,700 AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$5,314,775 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF (1) CONSTRUCTING OR PURCHASING BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, (2) REMODELING AND MAKING ADDITIONS TO SCHOOL BUILDINGS, AND (3) EQUIPPING SCHOOL BUILDINGS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

- \* CONSTRUCTING A NEW MIDDLE SCHOOL IN CHEYENNE MEADOWS/ CHEYENNE HILLS TO REPLACE GORMAN MIDDLE SCHOOL ;
- \* CONSTRUCTING A NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EAST OF ACADEMY BLVD. IN THE AREA CURRENTLY KNOWN AS SOARING EAGLES TO ACCOMMODATE GROWTH AND ALLEVIATE OVERCROWDING ;
- \* CONSTRUCTING A NEW K-8 SCHOOL BETWEEN I-25 AND ACADEMY BLVD. IN THE AREA CURRENTLY KNOWN AS SPRING CREEK TO ACCOMMODATE GROWTH AND ALLEVIATE OVERCROWDING ;
- \* MAKING ADDITIONS TO AND REMODELING CARMEL MIDDLE SCHOOL, GIBERSON AND OAK CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS;
- \* REMODELING THE GORMAN BUILDING TO RELOCATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES, NEW HORIZONS ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL, ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND OTHER DISTRICT PROGRAMS;
- \* RECARPETING OAK CREEK, WILDFLOWER, OTERO, TURMAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS AND SIERRA HIGH SCHOOL;
- \* UPGRADING THE HEATING AND AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEMS AT SIERRA AND HARRISON HIGH SCHOOLS AND STRATTON MEADOWS ELEMENTARY;
- \* ROOF REPLACEMENT FOR SEVERAL SCHOOLS;
- \* REPLACING AND UPGRADING DISTRICT TECHNOLOGY, INCLUDING CLASSROOM COMPUTERS;
- \* INSTALLING ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AT ALL SCHOOLS;
- \* INSTALLING SECURITY SYSTEMS AT ALL SCHOOLS.

AND SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE OR AMOUNT, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS OR ANY REFUNDING BONDS (OR TO CREATE A RESERVE FOR SUCH PAYMENT); SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 7%; SUCH BONDS TO BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH BONDS AND THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH PROCEEDS AND REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 - 2002 (estimate)	\$ 78,987,513
2000 - 2001 (actual)	\$ 73,820,106
1999 - 2000 (actual)	\$ 74,159,760
1998 - 1999 (actual)	\$ 70,021,924
1997 - 1998 (actual)	\$ 73,840,179

Overall percentage change from 1997 - 1998 to 2001 - 2002 6.97%  
Overall dollar change from 1997 - 1998 to 2001 - 2002 \$ 5,147,334

Proposed Tax Increase:

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase For Fiscal Year 2002 - 2003 (the First Full Fiscal Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):

BALLOT ISSUE C1: \$ 5,314,775

District Estimate of 2002 - 2003 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase: \$ 81,048,138

**HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2  
QUESTION C1 (cont)**

Information on the District's Proposed Debt:

BALLOT ISSUE C1:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:	Not to exceed	\$ 60,000,000
Maximum Annual District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed	\$ 5,314,775
Total District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed	\$ 131,582,700

Information on District's Current Outstanding Debt\*:

Principal Balance of District's Current Bonded Debt:	\$ 33,080,750
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$ 4,627,499
Remaining Total Repayment Cost:	\$ 46,048,122

\* Excluded from debt are enterprise and annual appropriation obligations

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* In a free society, taxpayers decide whether or not to keep the quality of schools and education high. Fortunately, to meet the district's needs, the increase in taxes will be minimal, approximately \$2.42 a month for the owners of homes valued at \$157,000. So, for less than the price of a value meal at a local burger joint, we can give our students the best learning opportunities and facilities.
- \* Harrison School District 2 has earned a reputation for being fiscally responsible. The district will only request voter approval for tax increases when a genuine need exists. Money is only spent in areas approved by taxpayers. Promises made, promises kept.
- \* Harrison School District is concerned about our senior citizen taxpayers living on fixed incomes. We encourage them to seek tax relief through the Homestead Act. Qualified seniors can have as much as half of their property tax burden reduced.
- \* Significant growth throughout the school district is obvious. Developers have submitted plans to build more than 4,600 living units over the next 3 to 5 years. This means that we will have a tremendous increase in the numbers of students attending our schools, and with many of our schools already at capacity, passage of C1 will allow us to avoid overcrowding in our schools.
- \* Bonds will be sold in two stages, each stage valued at \$30 million dollars. In the event that an economic recession causes developers to delay their plans, we can delay or cancel issuing the second set of bonds.
- \* Unfortunately, in today's society, schools need to continue providing safe learning environments for all of our students. Passage of C1 will allow the Harrison School District to install unobtrusive security systems in all schools.
- \* In order for our students to compete equally with students from other districts, we need to continue to upgrade and replace aging, obsolete technology.
- \* In upholding our reputation for being fiscally conservative, we have the lowest mill levy in the area. The amount that taxpayers pay for schools has remained constant the past four fiscal years.
- \* Vote yes on C1 for K.I.D.S. (Keep Improving District Schools).

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* A yes vote for issue C1 will create a tax increase for all homeowners.
- \* Measure C1 is very specific. Does District 2 have a contingency plan in case builders decide to not follow through with their development plans?
- \* Has District 2 taken senior citizens on fixed incomes into consideration?
- \* This \$131.6 million tax increase is the largest in district history. \$71.6 million pays interest, which doesn't educate one child. Let's stop passing the bills to our children and grandchildren with deficit spending. The district tried \$27 million of debt in 1998 and lost. Losing didn't hurt them. Now they want more than twice that sum! Last year, we generously voted a huge tax increase, squandered on double-digit pay raises, with nothing spent on these supposedly vital improvements. They're never satisfied. Vote "NO" on C1.
- \* We are in a war and a recession. This is not the time to raise taxes and debt. It will devastate our local economy. Note this year's tax hikes.
- \* The issue is what goes on inside the classroom, not how pretty buildings are outside. C1 won't raise test scores or lower dropout rates. 86% of students did poorly on one CSAP test. If 80% of budgets weren't for salaries, schools could practice fiscal discipline and set aside money for buildings, saving the \$71.6 million interest cost of this laundry list of random projects, many caused by years of intentional neglect.
- \* C1 focuses on finances, not academics. We need education reform—higher standards. Merit pay for good teachers, ending tenure (to remove bad ones). More choice and creativity, parental control, a return to basics, and less bureaucracy. This just throws more money at schools.
- \* Borrowing for 25 years to buy carpet that wears out in five years is crazy.
- \* Study the government's 5-year spending history. It shows no "budget cuts." Has your income gone up that fast? Why can't that increase be used instead of taxes and debt?
- \* Why replace a school instead of improving it? Why are employee salaries higher than average taxpayers? Is there some school spending you dislike? Voting "NO" is the only way to make budget priorities change.
- \* We must make hard choices schools won't. There's not enough performance and accountability now.
- \* Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes, like seniors and low-income citizens. Colorado has the 6th highest overall local taxes in America. Do you want your property taxes increased "in any year, without limitation of rate or amount," without voting on the increase?

HARRISON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 2  
QUESTION C1 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* Are there too many administrators? Can more services be privatized? Can some assets be sold? Have they considered all alternatives?
- \* Should we reward lack of routine maintenance, which is part of every family and business budget? Basics should not cost extra.
- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better—you or some bureaucracy? Raising taxes means less to spend on your children. It also piles more debt on the next generation. Vote "NO" on C1.

FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49  
QUESTION C2

Designated Election Official:

Rocal R. Lanotte  
Secretary to the Board of Education  
10850 East Woodmen Road  
Falcon, CO 80831  
(719) 495-3601

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND  
TO INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C2

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49 DEBT BE INCREASED \$28 MILLION, WITH A MAXIMUM REPAYMENT COST OF \$56 MILLION, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO \$3.5 MILLION ANNUALLY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAINTAINING OR REDUCING CLASS SIZES, REDUCING THE USE OF PORTABLE CLASSROOM TRAILERS DISTRICT-WIDE, PROVIDING A HIGH QUALITY LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR CHILDREN THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT AND REDUCING THE NEED FOR MULTI-TRACK, YEAR-ROUND SCHOOL BY CONSTRUCTING, FURNISHING AND EQUIPPING:

- \* AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE RIDGEVIEW DEVELOPMENT TO RELIEVE OVERCROWDING AT STETSON ELEMENTARY
- \* AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN THE SPRINGS RANCH DEVELOPMENT TO RELIEVE OVERCROWDING AT REMINGTON ELEMENTARY
- \* AN EXPANSION OF FALCON HIGH SCHOOL INCLUDING SIX NEW CLASSROOMS, A MULTI-PURPOSE PERFORMING ARTS AREA, RENOVATIONS TO CREATE ADDED CLASSROOM SPACE, AND AN EXPANDED CAFETERIA AREA
- \* AN EXPANSION OF SAND CREEK HIGH SCHOOL INCLUDING THIRTY-ONE NEW CLASSROOMS, AN ENLARGED COMMONS/CAFETERIA AREA, A NEW AUDITORIUM, AN AUXILIARY GYM, A WRESTLING ROOM AND A WEIGHT ROOM
- \* AN ADDITION TO HORIZON MIDDLE SCHOOL INCLUDING NINE NEW CLASSROOMS
- \* ADDITIONAL PERMANENT CLASSROOMS TO REPLACE AS MANY PORTABLE CLASSROOM TRAILERS AS POSSIBLE AT EVANS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

BY THE ISSUANCE AND PAYMENT OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, WHICH SHALL BEAR INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 7% AND MATURE, BE SUBJECT TO REDEMPTION, WITH OR WITHOUT PREMIUM, AND BE ISSUED, DATED AND SOLD AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES, AT SUCH PRICES (AT, ABOVE OR BELOW PAR) AND IN SUCH MANNER AND CONTAINING SUCH TERMS, NOT INCONSISTENT HERewith, AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY DETERMINE; AND SHALL AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES BE LEVIED IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE OR AMOUNT OR ANY OTHER CONDITION, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS AND TO FUND ANY RESERVES FOR THE PAYMENT THEREOF?

Actual Historical and Fiscal Year Spending Information:

1997-1998 (actual)	\$ 23,725,041
1998-1999 (actual)	\$ 28,542,265
1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 34,678,494
2000-2001 (estimated)	\$ 39,394,224
2001-2002 (current year estimated)	\$ 44,515,000

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1997-1998 through 2001-2002: 88%

Overall dollar change in fiscal year spending over the five year period from 1997-1998 through 2001-2002: \$ 20,789,959

Estimated 2001-2002 fiscal year spending without taking into account the tax increase authorized by the ballot proposal: \$ 44,515,000

FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49  
QUESTION C2 (cont)

Actual Historical and Fiscal Year Spending Information (cont):

Estimated 2001-2002 tax increase authorized by the ballot proposal: \$ 2,000,000

Information regarding Bonded Debt Proposed by the Ballot Proposal:

Principal amount: \$ 28,000,000  
Maximum annual repayment cost: \$ 3,500,000  
Maximum total repayment cost: \$ 56,000,000

Information regarding Current Bonded Debt:

Principal balance: \$ 33,960,000  
Maximum annual repayment cost: \$ 3,765,485  
Maximum remaining total repayment cost: \$ 55,156,882

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

PLEASE, VOTE "YES" ON QUESTION C2...TO KEEP THE PROMISE.

KEEPING THE PROMISE... That's the theme for the Falcon School District school construction bond campaign. It's more important now than ever. We must keep the promise to our children — our future — to provide the necessities of the quality education we all expect. Let's keep the promise of small class sizes, rigorous instruction with appropriate science and computer labs and other facilities, and a safe school environment conducive to learning.

Falcon is the fastest growing school district in Colorado. Falcon schools are currently 30% over capacity, and as a result, we have children cramped into spaces that are too small, inadequate, and unsafe.

ALMOST 100 CLASSROOMS ARE CURRENTLY HOUSED IN PORTABLE TRAILERS! More trailers are certain to cover our schools and playgrounds if we don't act now.

Each generation of Americans has been faced with its own unique set of challenges. We cannot know what the future holds for our children, but **we** can do our job to prepare them to be the best they can be. **A YES vote on C2** is a giant step in the right direction!

After passing two previous measures, the school district has rewarded our trust with a commitment to excellence. The district **KEPT THE PROMISE** and built new schools and additional classrooms **on time and under budget!** Our school tax rate is at its lowest in 10 years and is one of the lowest in the Pikes Peak region. Because of this frugal management, a **YES on C2** will only cost \$4 per month per \$100,000 of actual home value... quite a bargain for \$28 million in new schools.

We need to Vote **YES on C2** to reduce class sizes, increase the safety and discipline in our schools, and improve the academic rigor of our students. But we cannot do those things without adequate space in our schools.

- YES on C2** will:
- \* Build a **New Elementary School** (capacity of 600) in the Ridgeview Development [to relieve overcrowding at Stetson Elementary]
  - \* Build a **New Elementary School** in the Springs Ranch Development [to relieve overcrowding at Remington Elementary]
  - \* Expand **Falcon High School's** capacity from 530 to 680 including:  
6 new classrooms and renovations to create additional classrooms, Multipurpose area including Performing Arts Facility, and an Expanded Cafeteria serving area
  - \* Fulfill the planned expansion of **Sand Creek High School** from 825 to 1600 including:  
31 new classrooms  
23 classrooms with an Industrial Arts Facility  
6 Science Labs  
2 Computer Labs  
Enlarged Commons and Cafeteria  
New Auditorium  
Auxiliary Gym  
Wrestling Room  
Weight Room
  - \* Expansion of **Horizon Middle School** from 500 to 650 including:  
9 new classrooms consisting of  
6 classrooms  
2 Science Labs  
Computer Lab
  - \* Build approximately 6 new classrooms at **Evans Elementary** to replace trailers.  
Let's keep the Promise of Falcon Schools alive — Vote **YES on C2**.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* This \$56 million tax increase is the largest in district history. Half pays only interest, which doesn't educate one child. Isn't there enough government debt now? Let's stop passing the bills to children and grandchildren with deficit spending. The district gets automatic yearly increases for enrollment plus inflation. We voted a huge school spending increase last November. They're never satisfied. Vote "NO" on C2.
- \* We are in a war and a recession. This is not the time to raise taxes and debt. It will devastate our local economy. We had a 21% average home reassessment this year. Look at this year's tax hikes. How much more can citizens take?

FALCON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 49  
QUESTION C2 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* The district says this is needed because of growth. But each new student is already paid for. Revenue increases automatically for increased students plus inflation. C2 would be a windfall. The district saves nothing in its budget for buildings, as private business does. They just create a crisis, then demand more money.
- \* The issue is what goes on inside the classroom, not how pretty buildings are outside. C2 won't raise test scores or lower dropout rates. If 80% of budgets weren't for salaries, schools could practice fiscal discipline, set aside money for buildings, save the \$28 million interest cost of this laundry list of projects.
- \* C2 focuses on finances, not academics. We need education reform — higher standards, merit pay for good teachers, ending tenure (to remove bad ones), more choice and creativity, parental control, a return to basics, and less bureaucracy. This just throws more money at schools. No one can avoid responsibility by writing or taking a check.
- \* Study the government's 5-year spending history. It shows no "budget cuts." Has your income gone up that fast? Why can't that increase be used instead of taxes and debt?
- \* What about wasteful spending? Why are employee salaries higher than average taxpayers'? Is there some school spending you dislike? Voting "NO" is the only way to make budget priorities change.
- \* We must make hard choices schools won't. There's not enough performance and accountability now.
- \* Is their repayment method fair? Property taxes hurt people on fixed incomes, like seniors and low-income citizens. Colorado has the 6<sup>th</sup> highest overall local taxes in America. Do you want your property taxes increased "in any year, without limitation as to rate or amount or any other condition," without voting on the increase? That's a blank check.
- \* Are there too many administrators? Can more services be privatized? Can some assets be sold? Have they considered all alternatives?
- \* Should we reward lack of routine maintenance, which is part of every family and business budget? Basics should not cost extra. Only "tough love" will reduce waste and achieve reforms.
- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better — you or some bureaucracy? Raising taxes means less to spend on your children. It piles more debt on the next generation. Vote "NO" on C2.

ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20  
QUESTION C3

Designated Election Official:

Mary Lou Sherwood  
Secretary to the Board of Education  
7610 North Union Boulevard  
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT 20  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C3

SHALL EL PASO COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20 (ACADEMY) DEBT BE INCREASED \$163,000,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$313,753,000 AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$14,939,400 ANNUALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF (1) ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING OR PURCHASING BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, (2) ENLARGING, IMPROVING, REPAIRING AND MAKING ADDITIONS TO SCHOOL BUILDINGS, AND (3) EQUIPPING SCHOOL BUILDINGS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

- \* CONSTRUCTING 1 HIGH SCHOOL, 1 MIDDLE SCHOOL AND 4 ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS,
- \* MAKING ADDITIONS TO PINE CREEK HIGH SCHOOL AND RAMPART HIGH SCHOOL,
- \* PROVIDING FOR TECHNOLOGY FOR ALL STUDENTS AND ALL BUILDINGS,
- \* REPAIRING, REMODELING, REPLACING, IMPROVING OR UPGRADING ALL THE DISTRICT'S EXISTING BUILDINGS,

PROVIDED THAT ALL EXPENDITURES SHALL BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20 BOARD OF EDUCATION RESOLUTION NO. 262 ADOPTED ON SEPTEMBER 6, 2001; AND SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR, WITHOUT LIMITATION OF RATE OR AMOUNT, TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH BONDS OR ANY REFUNDING BONDS (OR TO CREATE A RESERVE FOR SUCH PAYMENT); SUCH DEBT TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 7%; SUCH BONDS TO BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS

ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20  
QUESTION C3 (cont)

Question: C3 (cont)

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH BONDS AND THE REVENUES FROM SUCH TAXES AND ANY EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH PROCEEDS AND REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001-2002 (estimated)	\$ 98,132,862
2000-2001 (actual)	\$ 89,273,768
1999-2000 (actual)	\$ 82,016,264
1998-1999 (actual)	\$ 77,734,703
1997-1998 (actual)	\$ 77,581,580

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending from 1997/8 to 2001/2: 26.49%

Overall dollar amount of change from 1997/8 to 2001/2: \$ 20,551,282

Estimated maximum dollar amount of proposed tax increase for 2002-2003: \$ 14,939,400

Estimated 2002-2003 fiscal year spending without proposed tax increase: \$ 106,285,505

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

District 20 schools have worked hard to maintain a longstanding tradition of academic excellence. The entire community deserved a share of the credit when the district's kids made headlines this year for scoring among international leaders in math and science. We all share in the benefits of high property values, strong neighborhoods and well-educated students that result from our quality schools.

- \* Continuing to provide a quality-learning environment for tomorrow's leaders brings many challenges. Chief among them is ensuring that we can provide adequate schools for our growing student population. The district's population has grown by over 30% since 1995 and is projected to grow an additional 20% in the next 6 years. D-20 buildings will not accommodate more students in our middle and high schools within a year unless we act now. Not far behind are our elementary schools.
- \* Meanwhile an audit conducted by an independent firm found that our existing buildings had many structural problems such as leaky roofs and drainage problems. Renovations to these buildings are needed so that our schools remain safe and productive places to learn.

What We Get From the School Bond:

- \* After months of intensive examination of the long-term capital needs of D-20, a citizen-led committee submitted to the Board of Education its recommendations regarding investments required to maintain excellence into the future.
- \* In response, the Board referred to district voters ballot question C3, a \$163 million bond issue that includes six new schools, two major elementary renovations, two high school additions and building and technology improvements to every school.

We Will Get So Much For So Little:

- \* Because the district's property tax base has grown substantially, our overall tax rate will not increase if voters approve this bond issue. However, if the value of your home increases, you would see modest increases in the total amount of property taxes you pay. If the assessed valuation of an existing home valued at \$200,000 increases by 10%, then taxes on this home would increase by approximately \$38 per year. That's a little over \$3 per month to keep our neighborhoods strong, preserve our property values and, most importantly, keep providing our kids with an excellent education.

Huge Tax Break Coming For Seniors:

- \* Seniors over 65 who have owned and lived in their home for 10 years or more will have their property tax bills cut in half starting in 2003, thanks to the "homestead exemption" passed by the legislature and state voters. While the value of our homes will continue to increase because of the quality of our schools, some seniors will see a reduction in property taxes of up to 50%. The school district will not lose any money due to this act; the state will make up the difference.

Great Kids. Great Schools. Great Communities:

- \* D-20 has earned its reputation for academic excellence through a strong partnership with the community it serves. Let's continue this tradition. Please vote YES on question C3.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* D-20 plans to spend \$150,753,000 of taxpayers' money on interest payments that will not buy or repair any buildings.

ACADEMY SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 20  
QUESTION C3 (cont)

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* If issue C3 is approved, the tax increase for residential property valued at \$200,000 will result in property owners being forced to pay D-20 \$1,185 annually.
- \* Approval of issue C3 would grant D-20 the power to increase the mill levy in any year, without limitation of rate or amount, even if the market value of your property decreases.
- \* Proponents of C3 assume property values will continue to increase by 10% per year. They disregard the historical average annual increase of 4.2% since 1980.
- \* Two years ago, D-20 spent \$98,071,199. With 16,136 full-time equivalent students, that amounted to \$6,077.79 per student. Instruction costs—teachers' compensation and supplies—were \$48,935,409, or \$3,032.69 per student. By eliminating much wasteful non-instructional expenditure, approval of C3 is unnecessary.
- \* Approval of C3 will not make private educational choices more feasible. The resulting property tax increase will only make it more financially difficult for parents to afford the costs of private educational alternatives and for others to donate money for private educational programs.
- \* Only by rejecting C3 will you prevent your elected representatives from further increasing the danger of public debt to you, your children and your grandchildren.
- \* D-20 student population grew from 13,700 to 17,540 students from 1995-2001 and is projected to be over 21,000 by 2006. While the need for new facilities to support the growth is real, voters should oppose these bonds because the District has not provided sufficient details on where the schools will be built. We could delay building now and go to split shift school days. This would be a tremendous inconvenience to families, but it's time the District pay more attention to keeping the tax burden low, even if delaying building of the schools may have a negative impact on the value of our homes.
- \* While technology has become a critical component in education, the District has not provided an adequate roadmap on how the technology funds would be spent.
- \* The District is asking for funds to perform maintenance that has not been done in previous years. Our budget problem is a result of the lack of sufficient state funding and budget limitations. Why should the District fund a problem that the State created?
- \* We should also oppose this bond issue because it doesn't include funding for investments needed in upgrading our bus maintenance facilities or central administration offices.
- \* The reality is that for most homeowners, it is likely that taxes will go up due to increases in their property value. While it may only be a small amount (about \$3/month for a home owner with a \$200,000 home), this is still a tax increase.
- \* The District has proposed including a financial accountability review committee, but they have not yet provided the guidelines.
- \* Vote NO on C3.

COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11  
QUESTION C4

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

TABOR, or Amendment 1, passed into law in 1992, gave voters the opportunity to decide on all tax increases or indebtedness for government entities. It further limited revenue and spending to growth-plus-inflation for all government entities, including public schools.

Measure C4 fully protects the voter's right to decide all tax increases, but relaxes the constraint on limiting revenue and spending to growth-plus-inflation—a change school districts need to meet the state and national challenges for vastly improved excellence in education.

Colorado voters recognize the need for this change. Amendment 23, passed last year by voters, overrides the TABOR revenue and spending limits by increasing state education spending to at least the rate of inflation plus 1 percent for the next 10 years.

School District 11 voters also overrode the TABOR revenue and spending limits in November 2000 by passing a property tax increase, or mill levy override.

**With this additional funding already passed into law, what effect does TABOR have on School District 11?**

- \* District 11 is currently nearing its TABOR revenue cap. With the cap, District 11 will soon have to turn down thousands of private, non-taxpayer dollars each year in grants, awards, corporately funded programs and donations, as well as state grants targeted for low-performing schools in low income neighborhoods, teacher training, etc.
- \* If D-11 pursues these opportunities and exceeds the TABOR cap, excess revenues would have to be refunded. These refunds would not even come back to D-11 voters, but would be returned to the State of Colorado and could eventually end up in areas outside of District 11.
- \* TABOR gave voters the right to choose: Taxpayers in 93% (164 of 176) of Colorado school districts have chosen to eliminate the revenue cap and support innovative efforts to improve education.

**District 11 Is Not Asking For A Tax Increase.** It simply wants to be able to keep private corporation support and state supplemental grants that it is able to generate.

- \* To avoid going over the TABOR cap, D-11 has already started curtailing its highly successful pursuit of private funding support. For example, a cell phone company recently offered the district nearly \$15,000 a year to place a transmission tower on district-owned property, but D-11 had to turn the money away.
- \* District 11 has led the nation in bringing a business-like, entrepreneurial approach to funding school programs. It is wrong to discourage the efforts of creative, contributing teachers and staff members who take the initiative to apply for D-11's fair share of grants and endowments, only to have to turn those hard sought-after dollars back to the state. Unless this measure is approved, the District will soon be forced to look solely to taxpayers to shoulder the burden of educational funding.
- \* After years of doing without, our kids deserve to have the benefit of every dollar that District 11 is able to raise for them from NON-TAXPAYER sources.
- \* Vote "YES" on Measure C4.

**Summary of written comments against the proposal:**

- \* Throwing more money won't improve education. Focusing on finances and pushing soft drinks, while minimizing academic achievement, has led to the mess we have now. D-11 doesn't even specify what the money's for. We need higher standards, merit pay for good teachers, an end to tenure (to remove the few bad teachers), more parental choices, and a return to basics. "Tax and spend" doesn't work. Vote "NO" on C4.
- \* D-11 just had a debt over \$100 million approved, plus \$30 million tax increases. They'll never be satisfied. They'll just whine "children" and "education" until they drain us dry. They also resist private schools, which do better at half cost. D-11 students are mere captives, forced to remain to secure more taxes.
- \* C4 takes away our tax refunds FOREVER. Why not a one-year exemption, specific amount, specific purpose? If you want to return your refund, fine. But don't deprive others who may need it.
- \* C4 prevents fiscal accountability. D-11 will have no limits left. C4 says election requirements remain, but that's a lie. C4 takes away required elections on excess revenue FOREVER.
- \* D-11's finance director threatens to send our refunds to the state. That is disgraceful blackmail. The constitution provides for excess revenue refunds to taxpayers. On August 22, he called the state, "our biggest taxpayer." 10-year-olds know governments don't pay taxes, they only collect them. With that ignorance, no wonder D-11 finances are screwed up! What are they teaching in class? Scary.
- \* Tax limits don't apply to private gifts or federal funds. That is another D-11 lie.

COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11  
QUESTION C4

Designated Election Official:

Carol McFarlane  
1115 North El Paso Street  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903  
(719) 520-2004

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C4

SHALL COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11 BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND SPEND ALL REVENUES IT RECEIVES IN 2001 AND THEREAFTER AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW; PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THIS AUTHORIZATION SHALL IN NO WAY AFFECT OR LIMIT THE FOLLOWING RESTRICTIONS, REQUIREMENTS OR PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION: (1) VOTER APPROVAL OF ALL NEW TAXES AND TAX RATE INCREASES; (2) VOTER APPROVAL FOR MULTIPLE-YEAR SCHOOL DISTRICT DEBT; (3) EXISTING AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX RESTRICTIONS; AND (4) THE ELECTION REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION?

**COLORADO SPRINGS SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 11  
QUESTION C4 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* The state constitution says we can waive voting on tax refunds "up to four years." C4 tries for FOREVER. What kind of example is it to children, when school board members, who took an oath to obey the constitution, ignore the law? The constitution also says, "voter-approved revenue changes are dollar amounts." There is no dollar amount in their request. C4 will trigger lawsuits and hurt education. Taxpayers would pay both sides of legal battles D-11 will lose.
- \* Average 21% county home reassessments means 21% D-11 tax increases. Similar increases will apply every two years from now on. There will be no tax rate decline as an offset, for revenue to equal inflation plus student growth. C4 means they can increase fees for textbooks, athletics, etc. without limit.
- \* Over 80% goes for salaries alone. Higher pay does not mean better education.
- \* Has school spending risen faster than your income? 86% of students recently couldn't pass basic tests. Where is the money going? Don't return to the bad old days of unlimited spending.
- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better- you or government? Keep your tax refunds for your child's clothing, school supplies, computer, etc.
- \* Enough is enough! We need tax relief and true school reform.
- \* Make D-11 live on a budget, not a blank check. Practice "tough love" to make them reform education. Vote "NO" on C4.

**HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28  
QUESTION C5**

Designated Election Official:

Nancy Uldrikson  
Hanover School  
17050 Peyton Highway  
Colorado Springs, CO 80928

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES AND DEBT  
HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C5

SHALL HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO.28 DEBT BE INCREASED \$12 MILLION WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF \$23 MILLION, AND SHALL DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$1.1 MILLION ANNUALLY TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES.

- \* CONSTRUCTING, EQUIPPING AND FURNISHING A NEW SECONDARY SCHOOL AND RELATED FACILITIES;
- \* RENOVATION, REMODELING, EXPANDING, IMPROVING AND EQUIPPING THE EXISTING KINDERGARTEN THROUGH 12<sup>TH</sup> GRADE SCHOOL FACILITIES IN CONNECTION WITH CONVERSION OF THE FACILITIES TO AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL;
- \* CONSTRUCTING, EQUIPPING, FURNISHING, AND ACQUIRING PROPERTY FOR NEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FACILITIES; AND

SHALL THE MILL LEVY BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE OR AMOUNT TO PAY THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON SUCH DEBT OR ANY REFUNDING DEBT (OR TO CREATE A RESERVE FOR SUCH PAYMENT); TO BE EVIDENCED BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT TO EXCEED 7.5%; AND SUCH BONDS MAY BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE, FOR A PRICE ABOVE OR BELOW THE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT OF SUCH SERIES, ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS, AND WITH SUCH MATURITIES AS PERMITTED BY LAW AND AS THE BOARD OF EDUCATION MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR REDEMPTION OF THE BONDS PRIOR TO THE MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM; AND SHALL THE DISTRICTS DEBT LIMIT BE INCREASED FROM AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO 20% OF THE DISTRICTS ASSESSED VALUE TO AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO 6% OF THE DISTRICTS ACTUAL VALUE, AS CALCULATED BY THE COUNTY ASSESSOR; AND SHALL THE EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF SUCH BOND PROCEEDS AND TAX REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND EXCEPTION TO THE LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

**HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 28  
QUESTION C5 (cont)**

Total District Fiscal Year Spending:

2001 - 2002 (estimate)	\$ 2,613,560
(may be adjusted based on October 1, 2001 actual student count)	
2000 - 2001 (actual)	\$ 2,715,001
1999 - 2000 (actual)	\$ 1,836,506
1998 - 1999 (actual)	\$ 1,570,454
1997 - 1998 (actual)	\$ 1,608,391

Overall percentage change from 1997 - 1998 to 2001 - 2002	62%
Overall dollar change from 1997 - 1998 to 2001 - 2002	\$ 1,005,169

Proposed Tax Increase:

District Estimate of the Maximum Dollar Amount of the Proposed Tax Increase For Fiscal Year 2002 - 2003 (the First Full Fiscal Year of the Proposed Tax Increase):

BALLOT ISSUE C5: \$ 1,100,000

District Estimate of 2002 - 03 Fiscal Year Spending  
Without Proposed Tax Increase: \$ 2,875,000

Information on the District's Proposed Debt:

BALLOT ISSUE C5:

Principal Amount of Proposed Bonds:	Not to exceed	\$ 12,000,000
Maximum Annual District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed	\$ 1,100,000
Total District Repayment Cost:	Not to exceed	\$ 23,000,000

Information on District's Current Outstanding Debt\*:

Principal Balance of District's Current Bonded Debt:	\$ 0
Maximum Annual Repayment Cost:	\$ 0
Remaining Total Repayment Cost:	\$ 0

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

Student growth has increased by over 100 percent in the past 2 years. Equipment and space are limited overcrowding our classrooms. We need a new school to alleviate these issues and enhance the education of our children.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

\*Excluded from debt are enterprise and annual appropriation obligations.

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT  
QUESTION C6**

Designated Election Official:

Rich Campbell  
13990 Bradshaw Road  
Peyton, CO 80831  
(719) 749-2330

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: C6

SHALL THE PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23-JT COLORADO BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN AND EXPEND ALL EXCESS REVENUES AND OTHER FUNDS COLLECTED DURING THE 2000-01 FISCAL YEAR, AND THE FOUR FISCAL YEARS THEREAFTER, ENDING WITH THE 2004-05 FISCAL YEAR, FROM ANY SOURCE AND USE THEM FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES ONLY, NOTWITHSTANDING THE LIMITATIONS OF ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION; PROVIDED HOWEVER, THAT NO PROPERTY TAX MILL LEVY SHALL BE INCREASED AT ANY TIME NOR SHALL ANY NEW TAX BE IMPOSED WITHOUT THE PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE VOTERS OF THE PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23-JT AND FOLLOWING THE 2004-05 FISCAL YEAR SHALL THE DISTRICT UTILIZE FISCAL YEAR 2004-05 DOLLAR AMOUNTS AS THE BASE UPON WHICH FISCAL YEAR 2005-06 LIMITATIONS SHALL BE CALCULATED?

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT  
QUESTION C6 (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Aren't our taxes already high enough? There appears to be misconception that our school taxes are unusually high. Compared with all other Pikes Peak region school districts we rank at the very bottom in school tax rates. According to recent data, property taxes going to schools on a house assessed at \$100,000 are \$529 in Ellicott, \$465 in Falcon, and \$349 in Peyton. We are below Calhan and Simla in local funding for education.
- \* What about C6 and it's effect on tax refunds? Issue C6 has no effect on tax refunds to voters since the money in question, along with future excess revenues, would be sent back into Colorado's Education General Fund for redistribution to those school districts that are able to accept additional revenues. Vote "YES" on issue C6 to keep local dollars at home where they belong.
- \* What are other school districts doing? Out of 178 school districts in the state, an astounding 155 have passed TABOR override questions like C6. In order to pursue a wide variety of available state grants for libraries, technology, construction, etc., schools must be allowed to accept those additional state revenues. Vote "YES" on C6 to keep Peyton schools on equal footing with those 155 TABOR exempt school districts.
- \* Vote "YES" on C6 to simply enable the Peyton schools to keep money which has already been allocated to the school district by the state. C6 does not raise taxes and does not affect the ability for citizens to vote on future tax questions.
- \* Recent School Accountability Reports prepared by the Colorado Department of Education grade all Peyton schools overall academic performance as "average", precisely where the majority of schools in the state are ranked. State mandated CSAP scores show steady upward growth in learning and achievement. Vote "YES" on issue C6 to support proven instructional progress.
- \* Average annual teacher salaries in Peyton schools are \$30,926 compared to \$40,887 statewide. That's almost 25% less than the state average!! Keeping good teachers means staying fiscally competitive. Vote "YES" on C6.
- \* The TABOR amendment sharply limits the amount of money government can collect from taxpayers and spend each year. Isn't that a good thing? Mostly, yes. TABOR imposes a maze of tax and spending limits on government entities using formulas that limit each years growth in spending to last years spending multiplied by the sum of population growth and consumer price inflation.....It certainly wasn't meant to keep schools from participating in the biggest boom economy in United States history!!
- \* Most TABOR override ballot proposals ask for an infinite exemption. 90% have passed! Peyton schools is asking for a conservative 5-year exemption while adjusting the spending limit base to avoid future financial pitfalls. Support local education without relinquishing the voters right to permanent spending controls.
- \* Vote for smart growth. Vote to get your fair share. Vote "YES" on C6.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

- \* Throwing more money won't improve education. Focusing on finances and minimizing academic achievement has led to the situation we have now. District 23-JT needs to reform, not just spend more. They don't even specify what they'll spend it on. We need higher standards, merit pay for good teachers, an end to tenure (to remove the few bad teachers), more parental choices, and a return to basics. "Tax and spend" won't work anymore. Vote "NO" on issue C6.  
The school board doesn't say that C6 takes away your tax refunds for five years. Why not a one-year exemption of a specific amount for a specific purpose? They can't give your tax refund to the state; under the Taxpayer's Bill of Rights, it belongs to you. If you want to return it, fine. But don't deprive your neighbors and low-income and senior citizens who may need it.
- \* The state constitution says we can waive voting on tax refunds up to four years. C6 tries for five years. What kind of example is that for our children, when school board members, who took an oath to obey the constitution, ignore the law? The constitution also says, "voter-approved revenue changes are dollar amounts." There is no dollar amount in their request! It also says that voter-approved revenue changes "are exceptions to, and not part of, any district base." The end of this proposal wants to use one-year revenue in the last year as a new permanent base. C6 will trigger lawsuits, confusion in the budget, and hurt school children. Tax dollars would pay both sides of a long and expensive legal battle.  
It is illegal to ask two questions in one ballot issue – taking away your tax refunds, and changing (illegally) the future calculation of the spending limit base. If you disagree with either, you must vote NO. This fatal ambiguity would lose in court.  
C6 also means the average 21% county reassessment of homes will be a 21% tax increase. Similar increases will apply in two and four years. They agree not to RAISE the tax rate, but they want to trick you into giving up your legal right to a lowered level that still provides for increases for inflation and student growth. It also means they can increase fees for textbooks, athletics, etc. without limit.
- \* Over 80% goes for salaries alone. Higher pay does not mean better education.
- \* Has school spending risen faster than your income? Peyton test scores are low compared to many other districts. Where is the money going now? Don't return to the bad old days of unlimited spending. Demand performance before providing windfalls.

**PEYTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 23JT  
QUESTION C6 (cont)**

Summary of written comments against the proposal (cont):

- \* Who can spend your hard-earned money better—you or government? Keep your tax refunds for your child's clothing, school supplies, computer, etc.
- \* We need tax relief and true school reform.
- \* Make District 23-JT live on a budget, not a blank check. Practice "tough love" to make them reform education. Vote "NO" on issue C6

**CASCADE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D4**

Designated Election Official:

Oren McClure  
Secretary  
P.O. Box 366  
Cascade, CO 80809  
(719) 684-8007

NOTICE OF ELECTION ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
CASCADE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: D4

SHALL CASCADE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, WITHOUT CREATING ANY NEW TAX OR INCREASING ANY CURRENT TAX, BE PERMITTED TO RETAIN AND SPEND THE FULL PROCEEDS OF CASCADE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TAXES, FEES, CHARGES, GRANTS, RATES, TOLLS OR ANY OTHER REVENUES COLLECTED, OR AUTHORIZED BY LAW TO BE IMPOSED OR COLLECTED BY THE DISTRICT IN FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND IN ALL SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS, UTILIZING SUCH REVENUES FOR THE LAWFUL PURPOSES OF CASCADE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, AND SHALL SUCH REVENUES AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE APPLICABLE TO THE YEAR 2000 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, OR SECTION 29,1-301, COLORADO REVISED STATUTES?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$	45,612
2000 (actual)	\$	46,178
1999 (actual)	\$	44,182
1998 (actual)	\$	43,246
1997 (actual)	\$	41,638
Overall percentage change from 1997 to 2000		10.9%
Overall change from 1997 to 2000	\$	4,540

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D5**

Designated Election Official:

Margaret Samsel  
Secretary of the Board of Directors  
1811 B Street  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES  
STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

**STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D5**

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: D5

SHALL THE STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED UP TO FIFTY-EIGHT THOUSAND FORTY-FIVE DOLLARS AND ELEVEN CENTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL ASSISTANCE BY THE IMPOSITION OF AN ADDITIONAL MILL LEVY OF 1.5 MILLS UPON TAXABLE PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT, COMMENCING JANUARY 1, 2002 AND EACH YEAR THEREAFTER; AND SHALL THE STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BE ENTITLED TO COLLECT AND SPEND THE FULL REVENUES FROM SUCH TAX INCREASE REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE ANNUAL REVENUES FROM SUCH TAX INCREASE AND MILL LEVY INCREASE IN ANY YEAR IN WHICH IT IS IN EFFECT EXCEED THE ESTIMATED DOLLAR AMOUNT STATED ABOVE AND WITHOUT ANY OTHER LIMITATION OR CONDITION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING THE COLLECTION OR SPENDING OF ANY OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS BY THE STRATMOOR HILLS FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, AS A VOTER APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE AND AN EXCEPTION TO THE SPENDING, REVENUE RAISING, AND OTHER LIMITS WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE APPLY, UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, C.R.S. §29-1-301(1), OR OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$	453,113
2000 (actual)	\$	437,754
1999 (actual)	\$	425,209
1998 (actual)	\$	395,101
1997 (actual)	\$	423,815
Overall percentage change:		6.9%
Overall dollar amount change:	\$	29,298
Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002:	\$	58,045
Estimated 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$	478,695

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

The Benefits:

- \* Continuation of rapid response times to emergency incidents
- \* Keep pace with increasing demands for service
- \* Keep pace with 16.1% rate of inflation since 1997, while fire department budget has only increased 6.9%
- \* Maintain historically low dollar loss from fires
- \* Provide funding for upgraded communication system
- \* Provide funding to upgrade and replace our aging fire trucks
- \* Provide funding for obsolete equipment replacement
- \* Provide funding for new safety equipment

Failure To Approve Increase Will Result In:

- \* Firefighters and the community may be placed at risk by obsolete equipment
- \* Possible increase of property destruction, fire loss, greater extent of injury from accidents from slower response times due to unreliable fire trucks
- \* The fire department may not be able to communicate with other agencies on emergency scenes
- \* The fire department will not be able to implement needed purchase and replacement programs

Your Yes Vote:

- \* Will help maintain the high quality of professional services provided by the district
- \* Will provide continued public safety and peace of mind through low fire loss; property destruction; severity of injuries; and number of fatalities
- \* Will provide for increased firefighter and community safety through the upgrading and replacement of old and unreliable equipment

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE  
PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D6**

Designated Election Official:

Donna Arkowski  
12510 Black Forest Road  
Colorado Springs, CO 80908  
(719) 495-4300

**BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE  
PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D6 (cont)**

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE PROTECTION DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: D6

SHALL BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE PROTECTION DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$2,680,000, WITH A REPAYMENT COST OF NOT TO EXCEED \$4,674,400; AND SHALL BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE PROTECTION DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$235,800 ANNUALLY, OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF SUCH DISTRICT DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER MULTIPLE FISCAL YEAR FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, COMPLETING, INSTALLING AND/OR OPERATING AND MAINTAINING, OR OTHERWISE PROVIDING FIRE AND RESCUE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT; SUCH OBLIGATIONS BEARING INTEREST AT A MAXIMUM NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE OF 6.00% PER ANNUM; SUCH DEBT TO BE SOLD IN ONE SERIES OR MORE, ON TERMS AND CONDITIONS AS THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT MAY DETERMINE, INCLUDING PROVISIONS FOR SALE OF THE BONDS AT PRICE ABOVE OR BELOW PAR AND FOR REDEMPTION OR PREPAYMENT PRIOR TO MATURITY WITH OR WITHOUT PAYMENT OF THE PREMIUM; AND SHALL SUCH TAXES (TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY) BE INCREASED IN ANY YEAR WITHOUT LIMITATION AS TO RATE BUT ONLY IN AMOUNTS SUFFICIENT TO PRODUCE THE ANNUAL INCREASE SET FORTH ABOVE OR SUCH LESSER AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY (OR IMPOSED WITH SUCH LIMITATIONS AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT), TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM, IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S OBLIGATIONS; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH OBLIGATIONS, TAX REVENUE, GRANTS, AND ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND EARNINGS FROM THE INVESTMENT OF THE PROCEEDS FROM SUCH DEBT AND TAX REVENUE, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT WITHOUT LIMITATION OR CONDITION, AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE UNDER ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY OTHER LAW?

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2001 (estimated)	\$	524,590
2000 (actual)	\$	389,347
1999 (actual)	\$	504,987
1998 (actual)	\$	415,149
1997 (actual)	\$	244,500
Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending:		115%
Overall dollar amount of change:	\$	280,090
Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for 2002:	\$	235,800
Estimated 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase:	\$	452,000

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$	-0-
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	-0-
Total repayment cost:	\$	-0-

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal amount:	\$	2,680,000
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$	235,800
Total repayment cost:	\$	4,674,400

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* Based on recent and anticipated growth, both in population and public expectations concerning levels of service, the Black Forest Fire/Rescue Protection District (BFFRPD) needs to have a facility that encourages volunteer staffing during weeknights and weekends, rather than one that makes such service awkward and disruptive. In-station staffing translates into better response time to fire and rescue emergencies, and to a lower fire insurance cost for homeowners. Data suggest that many homeowners may actually save money because insurance cost decreases will exceed their increase in taxes.
- \* The existing fire station suffers from lot size and structural limitations that cannot efficiently be overcome by additions to the building. It is not cost effective to modify this structure to meet current and anticipated future requirements.
- \* Current low interest rate markets make it less expensive to borrow funds to build such a facility than is normally the case. Delaying the funding of this new fire station may increase borrowing costs substantially.

**BLACK FOREST FIRE/RESCUE  
PROTECTION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D6 (cont)**

Summary of written comments for the proposal (cont):

\* Black Forest residents are currently being charged 4.931 mills for fire and rescue protection. If the voters approve the general obligation bond for a new fire station, the mill levy rate for the bond will add about 3.5 mills to our tax bill. Based on the assessed value of my house, that will increase my tax bill by about \$68 per year. Comparing that amount of money to what is being charged by other taxing entities, or more importantly, to the value received in exchange, this expenditure is a wise use of my money.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND  
SANITATION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D7**

Designated Election Official:

Lyle L. Labbs  
Member, Board of Directors  
Garden Valley Water and Sanitation District  
2840 South Circle Drive  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906  
(719) 576-1000

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT, INCREASE REVENUE,  
INCREASE SPENDING, AND TO AUTHORIZE  
ACCEPTANCE OF STATE OR FEDERAL GRANT  
GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: D7

SHALL GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED BY AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$400,000 WITH A REPAYMENT COST NOT TO EXCEED \$788,122, SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR REVENUE BONDS OR PLEDGES, NOTES, CONTRACTS, OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR DIRECT OR INDIRECT DISTRICT DEBT OR OTHER FINANCIAL OBLIGATION WITHOUT ADEQUATE PRESENT CASH RESERVES PLEDGED IRREVOCABLY AND HELD IN ALL FUTURE FISCAL YEARS, AND PURSUANT THERETO TO BE AUTHORIZED TO OBTAIN A LOAN OR LOAN FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO OR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OR ANY OF THEIR AGENCIES OR SUBDIVISIONS, AND TO COLLECT AND SPEND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH LOAN OR LOANS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS IN THE APPROXIMATE AMOUNT OF \$300,000.00, BUT IN NO EVENT EXCEEDING \$400,000.00, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSES OF CONSTRUCTING OR INSTALLING WASTEWATER FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION WASTEWATER LINES, FLUMES, MEASURING DEVICES, VALVES, CONNECTION FACILITIES, METER STATIONS, AND ALL FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, PROPERTY RIGHTS, ENGINEERING SERVICES, LEGAL SERVICES, PERMITS, CONNECTION FEES, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT FEES, RECOVERY FEES, INSPECTION FEES NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT THEREFORE WITHOUT LIMITING THE COLLECTION OR SPENDING OF OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS BY THE DISTRICT IN 2001 AND EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY LIMITATION OF LAW ON DEBT, EXPENDITURE, RESERVES AND FUNDING OF RETENTION OF RESERVES, OR SPENDING THEREFORE, AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH INDEBTEDNESS CONSTITUTE VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGES AND BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT WITHOUT ANY LIMITATION CONTAINED IN ANY LAW OR WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY LEGISLATION IMPLEMENTING SAME.

The estimated total of District fiscal year spending for fiscal year 2001, the actual fiscal year spending for fiscal years 2000, 1999, 1998, and 1997, and the overall percentage and dollar change are as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total of District Fiscal Year Spending</u>	<u>Dollar Change</u>	<u>Percentage Change</u>
2001	\$184,858.00 (estimated)	-\$13,348.00	-6.7%
2000	\$198,206.00 (actual)	\$46,506.00	30.6%
1999	\$151,700.00 (actual)	\$13,151.00	9.5%
1998	\$138,549.00 (actual)	\$10,908.00	8.5%
1997	\$127,641.00 (actual)		

**GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND  
SANITATION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D7 (cont)**

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 44.8%  
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 57,217.00

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for year 2002: \$ -0-  
Estimated year 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 734,263.60

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* This is the same issue passed by the voters in 1994 and 1997. Due to an error in the wording on the Ballot in 1994, it had to be put back on the Ballot at this time. The sewer plant now in use has deteriorated to the point that it must be replaced or some other means of disposal found. Connecting to the City of Colorado Springs sewer is the most viable answer. We will not see a rise in taxes because of this change. The costs will be paid from revenues for sewer service to customers of Garden Valley Water and Sanitation District.
- \* Garden Valley Water & Sanitation District is a small District, therefore it makes economic sense to connect to the City of Colorado Springs sewer system instead of operating and maintaining its own sewer plant. The savings plus the revenue from the sewer customers of the Garden Valley Water & Sanitation District could be used to repay the loan and the monthly City sewer charges.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND  
SANITATION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D8**

Designated Election Official:

Lyle L. Labbs  
Member, Board of Directors  
Garden Valley Water and Sanitation District  
2840 South Circle Drive  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906  
(719) 576-1000

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT, INCREASE REVENUE,  
INCREASE SPENDING, AND TO AUTHORIZE  
ACCEPTANCE OF STATE OR FEDERAL GRANT  
GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

Question: D8

SHALL GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE A GRANT OR GRANTS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO OR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA OR ANY OF THEIR AGENCIES OR SUBDIVISIONS AND IF OBTAINED TO COLLECT AND SPEND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH GRANT OR GRANTS IN THE APPROXIMATE AMOUNT OF \$200,000.00, BUT IN NO EVENT EXCEEDING \$300,000.00 FOR THE PURPOSES OF CONSTRUCTING OR INSTALLING WASTEWATER FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION WASTEWATER LINES, FLUMES, MEASURING DEVICES, VALVES, CONNECTION FACILITIES, METER STATIONS, AND ALL FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, PROPERTY RIGHTS, ENGINEERING SERVICES, LEGAL SERVICES, PERMITS, CONNECTION FEES, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT FEES, RECOVERY FEES, INSPECTION FEES NECESSARY OR CONVENIENT THEREFORE WITHOUT LIMITING THE COLLECTION OR SPENDING OF OTHER REVENUES OR FUNDS BY THE DISTRICT IN 2001 AND EACH SUBSEQUENT YEAR AND WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY EXPENDITURE OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION OR ANY LEGISLATION IMPLEMENTING SAME.

The estimated total of District fiscal year spending for fiscal year 2001, the actual fiscal year spending for fiscal years 2000, 1999, 1998, and 1997, and the overall percentage and dollar change are as follows:

**GARDEN VALLEY WATER AND  
SANITATION DISTRICT  
QUESTION D8 (cont)**

Year	Total of District Fiscal Year Spending	Dollar Change	Percentage Change
2001	\$184,858.00 (estimated)	-\$13,348.00	-6.7%
2000	\$198,206.00 (actual)	\$46,506.00	30.6%
1999	\$151,700.00 (actual)	\$13,151.00	9.5%
1998	\$138,549.00 (actual)	\$10,908.00	8.5%
1997	\$127,641.00 (actual)		

Overall percentage change in fiscal year spending: 44.8%  
Overall dollar amount change: \$ 57,217.00

Estimated maximum dollar amount of tax increase for year 2002: \$ -0-  
Estimated year 2002 fiscal year spending without tax increase: \$ 734,263,60

Information on Current Bonded Debt:

Principal amount: \$ -0-  
Maximum annual repayment cost: \$ -0-  
Total repayment costs: \$ -0-

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

- \* This is the same issue passed by the voters in 1994 and 1997. Due to an error in the wording on the Ballot in 1994, it had to be put back on the Ballot at this time. The sewer plant now in use has deteriorated to the point that it must be replaced or some other means of disposal found. Connecting to the City of Colorado Springs sewer is the most viable answer. We will not see a rise in taxes because of this change. The costs will be paid from revenues for sewer service to customers of Garden Valley Water and Sanitation District.
- \* Garden Valley Water & Sanitation District is a small District, therefore it makes economic sense to connect to the City of Colorado Springs sewer system instead of operating and maintaining its own sewer plant. The savings plus the revenue from the sewer customers of the Garden Valley Water & Sanitation District could be used to repay the loan and the monthly City sewer charges.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**GREATER DOWNTOWN BUSINESS  
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
POLLING PLACE ELECTION**

Designated Election Official:

Jan Winkler  
3232 West Oak Creek Drive  
Colorado Springs CO 80906  
telephone (719)538.6044  
e-mail janwinkler@qwest.net

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE TAXES ON A  
REFERRED MEASURE (TABOR NOTICE)  
GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS  
BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001  
Election Hours: 7:00am to 7:00pm

Polling Location:

Colorado Square Building (foyer)  
2 North Nevada Avenue  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL THE GREATER DOWNTOWN COLORADO SPRINGS BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED BY \$550,776 ANNUALLY (FIRST FULL FISCAL YEAR DOLLAR INCREASE) BY COMMENCING IMPOSITION OF A MILL LEVY OF FIVE (5) MILLS IN 2001, TO BE PAID IN 2002, AND A LEVY OF FIVE (5) MILLS OR LESS CONTINUING ANNUALLY THEREAFTER ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY WITHIN SAID DISTRICT FOR THE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF SAID DISTRICT?

**GREATER DOWNTOWN BUSINESS  
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT  
POLLING PLACE ELECTION (cont)**

Fiscal Year Spending Information:

2002 (estimated)	\$ 550,776
2001	\$ -0-
2000	\$ -0-
1999	\$ -0-
1998	\$ -0-
1997	\$ -0-

Overall Percentage Change from 1998 to 2002: Not applicable  
Overall Dollar Change from 1996 to 2002: \$ 550,776

District Estimates of Maximum Dollar Amount of Tax Increase and of District Fiscal Year Spending Without the Increase for First Full Fiscal Year of Proposed Tax Increase:

Estimated Maximum Dollar Amount of Tax Increase for 2002: \$ 550,776  
Estimated 2002 Fiscal Year Spending Without Proposed Tax Increase: \$ -0-

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

An expanded BID will enable the private sector to continue and broaden the scope of streetscape improvements and maintenance and to commence a long-awaited circulator shuttle service throughout the downtown. The artwork and sidewalk improvements and new crosswalks in the existing BID have created a pedestrian friendly environment and added new flavor and distinction to downtown. The BID is the perfect vehicle to help downtown continue to grow and prosper as the city grows. We believe the BID is essential to the long term health of downtown.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

**FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL**

Designated Election Official:

Benjamin I. Green  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$25,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST NOT TO EXCEED \$200,000,000.00; AND SHALL FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$6,000,000.00 ANNUALLY OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY SUCH DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, STREET IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING CURBS, GUTTERS, CULVERTS, OTHER DRAINAGE FACILITIES, SIDEWALKS, BRIDGES, PARKING FACILITIES, PAVING, LIGHTING, GRADING, LANDSCAPING, AND OTHER STREET IMPROVEMENTS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONEYS OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF THIRTY FIVE (35) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH AS-

FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Ballot Title and Text (cont):

ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL

Designated Election Official:

Benjamin I. Green  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ANY AND ALL AMOUNTS ANNUALLY FROM ANY REVENUE SOURCES OTHER THAN AD VALOREM TAXES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TAP FEES, FACILITY FEES, SERVICE CHARGES, INSPECTION CHARGES, ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES, GRANTS, OR ANY OTHER FEE, RATE, TOLL, PENALTY, INCOME, OR CHARGE IMPOSED, COLLECTED, OR AUTHORIZED BY LAW TO BE IMPOSED OR COLLECTED BY THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL SUCH REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL

Designated Election Official:

Benjamin I. Green  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION  
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL FALCON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO ONE OR MORE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH ANY POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINTLY FINANCING THE COSTS OF ANY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, FACILITIES, SYSTEMS, PROGRAMS, OR PROJECTS WHICH THE DISTRICT MAY LAWFULLY PROVIDE, OR FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF THE DISTRICT AND ITS FACILITIES AND PROPERTIES, WHICH AGREEMENT MAY CONSTITUTE A DEBT OR INDEBTEDNESS AND A MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATION OF THE DISTRICT TO THE EXTENT PROVIDED THEREIN AND OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED BY LAW, AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO MAKE COVENANTS REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND USE OF AD VALOREM TAXES, RATES, FEES, TOLLS, PENALTIES, AND OTHER CHARGES OR REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT, OR ANY CONTRIBUTING POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AND COVENANTS, REPRESENTATIONS, AND WARRANTIES AS TO OTHER MATTERS ARISING UNDER THE AGREEMENTS, ALL AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT?

Fiscal Year Spending:

Pursuant to the Service Plan approved by the Board of County Commissioners of El Paso County, there is authorization for a certification of up to 50 mills annually, 2002 equivalency. Insofar as these are proposed districts, there is no estimate or total of district fiscal year spending for the current year, however the above ballot questions authorize the receipt and expenditure of up to \$5,000,000 annually.

Information On Current Bonded Debt:

None

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal:	\$5,500,000.00
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 538,231.44
Total repayment costs:	\$9,919,934.48

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

In summary, these referred measures authorize the District, if formed, to issue debt for the purpose of constructing certain road improvements to Woodmen Road, Eastonville Road, Meridian Road, Judge Orr Road and Stapleton Road.

WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL

Designated Election Official:

Douglas E. Woods  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT DEBT BE INCREASED \$25,000,000.00, WITH A REPAYMENT COST NOT TO EXCEED \$200,000,000.00; AND SHALL WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT TAXES BE INCREASED \$6,000,000.00 ANNUALLY OR BY SUCH LESSER ANNUAL AMOUNT AS MAY BE NECESSARY TO PAY SUCH DEBT; SUCH DEBT TO CONSIST OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS, INCLUDING CONTRACTS, ISSUED OR INCURRED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING, REIMBURSING, OR FINANCING ALL OR ANY PART OF THE COSTS OF ACQUIRING, CONSTRUCTING, RELOCATING, INSTALLING, COMPLETING, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING, WITHIN OR WITHOUT

WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL (cont)

Ballot Title and Text (cont):

THE BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT, STREET IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING CURBS, GUTTERS, CULVERTS, OTHER DRAINAGE FACILITIES, SIDEWALKS, BRIDGES, PARKING FACILITIES, PAVING, LIGHTING, GRADING, LANDSCAPING, AND OTHER STREET IMPROVEMENTS, TOGETHER WITH ALL NECESSARY, INCIDENTAL, AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, LAND, AND EASEMENTS, AND EXTENSIONS OF AND IMPROVEMENTS TO SAID FACILITIES, SUCH DEBT TO BEAR INTEREST AT A NET EFFECTIVE INTEREST RATE NOT IN EXCESS OF 16% PER ANNUM, SUCH INTEREST TO BE PAYABLE AT SUCH TIME OR TIMES AND WHICH MAY COMPOUND ANNUALLY OR SEMIANNUALLY AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE DISTRICT, SUCH DEBT TO BE ISSUED OR INCURRED AT ONE TIME OR FROM TIME TO TIME, TO BE PAID FROM ANY LEGALLY AVAILABLE MONIES OF THE DISTRICT, INCLUDING THE PROCEEDS OF AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAXES; SUCH TAXES TO CONSIST OF AN AD VALOREM MILL LEVY IMPOSED ON ALL TAXABLE PROPERTY OF THE DISTRICT IN AN AMOUNT NOT IN EXCESS OF TWENTY FIVE (25) MILLS, PROVIDED THAT SUCH MILL LEVY MAY BE ADJUSTED TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN LAW OR THE METHOD BY WHICH ASSESSED VALUATION IS CALCULATED; SUCH TAXES TO BE USED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING THE PRINCIPAL OF, PREMIUM IF ANY, AND INTEREST ON THE DISTRICT'S DEBT; AND SHALL THE PROCEEDS OF ANY SUCH DEBT AND THE PROCEEDS OF SUCH TAXES, ANY OTHER REVENUE USED TO PAY SUCH DEBT, AND INVESTMENT INCOME THEREON, BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE, WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL

Designated Election Official:

Douglas E. Woods  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO COLLECT, RETAIN, AND SPEND ANY AND ALL AMOUNTS ANNUALLY FROM ANY REVENUE SOURCES OTHER THAN AD VALOREM TAXES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO TAP FEES, FACILITY FEES, SERVICE CHARGES, INSPECTION CHARGES, ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES, GRANTS, OR ANY OTHER FEE, RATE, TOLL, PENALTY, INCOME, OR CHARGE IMPOSED, COLLECTED, OR AUTHORIZED BY LAW TO BE IMPOSED OR COLLECTED BY THE DISTRICT, AND SHALL SUCH REVENUES BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT AS A VOTER-APPROVED REVENUE CHANGE WITHOUT REGARD TO ANY SPENDING, REVENUE-RAISING, OR OTHER LIMITATION CONTAINED WITHIN ARTICLE X, SECTION 20 OF THE COLORADO CONSTITUTION, AND WITHOUT LIMITING IN ANY YEAR THE AMOUNT OF OTHER REVENUES THAT MAY BE COLLECTED AND SPENT BY THE DISTRICT?

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
ELECTION BY MAIL

Designated Election Official:

Douglas E. Woods  
%Susemihl, McDermott, Miller & Cowan  
660 Southpointe, Suite 210  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

NOTICE OF ELECTION TO INCREASE DEBT  
ON A REFERRED MEASURE  
WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT  
EL PASO COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO

Election Date: November 6, 2001

Ballot Title and Text:

SHALL WOODMEN ROAD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO ENTER INTO ONE OR MORE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH ANY POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF JOINTLY FINANCING THE COSTS OF ANY PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, FACILITIES, SYSTEMS, PROGRAMS, OR PROJECTS WHICH THE DISTRICT MAY LAWFULLY PROVIDE, OR FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FOR THE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF THE DISTRICT AND ITS FACILITIES AND PROPERTIES, WHICH AGREEMENT MAY CONSTITUTE A DEBT OR INDEBTEDNESS AND A MULTIPLE-FISCAL YEAR OBLIGATION OF THE DISTRICT TO THE EXTENT PROVIDED THEREIN AND OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED BY LAW, AND IN CONNECTION THEREWITH SHALL THE DISTRICT BE AUTHORIZED TO MAKE COVENANTS REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND USE OF AD VALOREM TAXES, RATES, FEES, TOLLS, PENALTIES, AND OTHER CHARGES OR REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT, OR ANY CONTRIBUTING POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AND COVENANTS, REPRESENTATIONS, AND WARRANTIES AS TO OTHER MATTERS ARISING UNDER THE AGREEMENTS, ALL AS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE DISTRICT?

Fiscal Year Spending:

Pursuant to the Service Plan approved by the Board of County Commissioners of El Paso County, there is authorization for a certification of up to 50 mills annually, 2002 equivalency. Insofar as these are proposed districts, there is no estimate or total of district fiscal year spending for the current year, however the above ballot questions authorize the receipt and expenditure of up to \$6,000,000 annually.

Information On Current Bonded Debt:

None

Information on Proposed Bonded Debt:

Principal:	\$ 9,574,039.95
Maximum annual repayment cost:	\$ 1,479,000.00
Total repayment costs:	\$ 23,709,625.00

Summary of written comments for the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

Summary of written comments against the proposal:

No comments were filed by the constitutional deadline.

In summary, these referred measures authorize the District, if formed, to issue debt for the purpose of constructing certain road improvements to Woodmen Road.

END OF BALLOT ISSUE NOTICE

As required by Colorado Statutes (C.R.S. 1-7-905), I hereby certify the ballot issue notices are complete as submitted by the political subdivisions.

J. Patrick Kelly  
El Paso County Clerk & Recorder